DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 591 HE 018 689

AUTHOR Elkin, Judith Laikin
TITLE The Great Lakes Colleges Association: Twenty-One Years of Cooperation in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION Great Lakes Colleges Association, Ann Arbor, Mich.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 136p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Church Related Colleges; *Consortia; Cooperative Programs; Experiential Learning; *Faculty Development; *Field Experience Programs; Financial Support; Governance; Grants; Higher Education; Humanities; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; *International Education; Liberal Arts; Lobbying; Political Issues
IDENTIFIERS *Great Lakes Colleges Association

ABSTRACT

The association among 12 private, church-related, residential, liberal arts colleges in Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio (The Great Lakes Colleges Association--GLCA) is discussed. Attention is directed to the founding of the consortium, international education, thematic off-campus programs, faculty development, the involvement of GLCA in the national higher education enterprise, and governance. Support from the Ford Foundation helped to establish non-Western Studies as a primary concern, including overseas study programs in Bogota, Tokyo, and Beirut. Other studies/activities have focused on Europe, Africa, and Asia. Two thematic off-campus programs (the New York Arts Program and the Philadelphia Urban Semester) expose students to city life, while other offerings include the Oak Ridge Science Semester, the Newberry Library Program in Humanities, and marine biology and wilderness programs. GLCA faculty development projects include: the Programmed Instruction Project, teaching internships, a humanities program, and the New Writers' Award. GLCA's legislative policy and involvement in the Washington network of major relevant associations concerned with national higher education and federal policy issues are also addressed, and information is provided on grants received by GLCA during 1963-1981. Different levels of governance, including the board, the faculty or academic council, and dean's council, are covered. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Denison University

ounded 1831

Earlham College

antioch

Wabash College

HOPE COLLEGE

DEPAUW UNIVERSITY
Greencastle, Indiana 46135

Albion

HE COLLEGE OF WOOSTER

KENYON COLLEGE

OBERLIN COLLEGE

ohio wesleyan university

Kalamazoo COLLEGE

ED261591

The GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Great Lakes Colleges Assoc.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE018629

Judith Laikin Elkin

THE GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION

TWENTY-ONE YEARS OF COOPERATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Judith Laikin Elkin

Great Lakes Colleges Association
220 Collingwood - Suite 240
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS vii

LIST OF TABLES ix

PREFACE xi

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I FOUNDING THE CONSORTIUM . . . 7

CHAPTER II INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION 17
The Ford Foundation Grant. Establishing Overseas Programs. The Task Force on International Education. The Bogota Program. American University of Beirut. East Asian Studies. Japan. Yugoslavia and Poland. European Urban Term. Madurai. Aberdeen. Africa. Israel. China. Summary and Analysis.

CHAPTER III THEMATIC OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS . . 45
Philadelphia Urban Semester. New York Arts Program. Oak Ridge Science Semester. Marine Biology. Wilderness Program. Newberry Library. Some Unrealized Possibilities. The Consortium at Ten.

CHAPTER IV FACULTY DEVELOPMENT 59
Programmed Instruction Project. Teaching Internships. Humanities Program. New Writers' Award. Faculty Development: Finding Ways. Faculty Development Begins. Conferences, Workshops, and Consultations. Career Renewal and Change. Some Observations. Women's Studies. GLCA in the Seventies.

CHAPTER V GLCA ENTERS THE NATIONAL SCENE . . 81
The Issue of Washington Representation. Should GLCA Merge with ACM? Evaluating the Washington Connection. The Decision against Merger. New Directions. The Independent Colleges Office. GLCA's Washington Network. The Fruits of Grantsmanship. Summary and Conclusions.

CHAPTER VI GOVERNANCE 101
Board of Directors. Faculty Governance. Deans' Council. International Education Committee. The Agent College. The Central Administration. Some Observations.

CHAPTER VII GLCA COMES OF AGE 123

A NOTE ON SOURCES 129

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

The Denison Campus in the 1940s 3

Two Nobel laureates: Robert A. Millikan and Arthur H. Compton 4

The 1965 GLCA Board 14

Staff of the Centro de Estudios Universitarios Colombo-Americano (CEUCA) 23

Awarding a Grant in Support of Japanese Studies 29

Participants in the Yugoslav Summer Seminar . . . 32

A Student Intern in the Philadelphia Urban Semester . 47

Apprenticeship in the New York Arts Program . . 49

Oak Ridge Science Semester Provides Research Opportunities for GLCA Students . . . 52

Staff of the Kenyon School of English in the 1950s . . 63

The 1982 Staff for the GLCA Summer Workshop in Course Design and Teaching 68

Women's Studies Conference Participants . . . 77

Senator Griffin receiving a GLCA delegation . . . 88

Deans' Council Meeting 107

LIST OF TABLES

Basic Information about GLCA Member Institutions . . . 5

Organizational Conference, April 16-17, 1961:
College Representatives 11

GLCA Presidents and Vice Presidents 15

Faculty Development Conferences, 1975-1982 70

Grants Received by GLCA, 1963-1981 95

GLCA Tuition Remission Exchange 119

PREFACE

The private, church-related, residential, liberal arts college was the first institution of higher education to be founded in America. Many such colleges, offering quality education in environments of a human scale, have been in continuous existence for a century and a half. They have compiled an outstanding record for academic achievement by their students and for the contributions to society made by their alumni. These are great institutions in the truest sense of that word, filling a leadership role without arrogance or apology.

This is the story of an association among twelve such colleges in the States of Indiana, Michigan, and Ohio. The story is one of supported differences, shared strengths, and a sense of mutual obligation. Its two major themes are the distinctiveness of each member college, and the vitality of the academic community that arose from recognition of shared characteristics and interests. Our cooperation has led to broader educational opportunity for our students, particularly internationally; increased professional challenge for our faculties and staffs; and the development of policy options for our colleges.

Since the founding of the Great Lakes Colleges Association in 1961, the environment within which higher education functions has changed from one that was supportive to one that threatens to restrict the range of services we offer and the number and type of students we can accommodate. Cooperation, which seemed at first a luxury we could afford in bouyant times, has become an important source of mutual support. Member Presidents of GLCA have not hesitated to utilize our joint strength as advocates of private undergraduate liberal arts education nationwide.

Our twentieth anniversary stimulated us to look back over what has been accomplished by the consortium in the past in an effort to increase our self-understanding, as well as to garner any lessons from it that may help us in the future. Judith Laikin Elkin, an historian who formerly taught at Albion College, was commissioned by our Board to write this history. She has had complete access to GLCA files and has interviewed many of those who were movers and shapers of GLCA. While Dr. Elkin has been provided with the necessary facilities for writing this history, she has retained complete freedom in the transcription and interpretation of events.

It is my hope that this history, which describes the successful initiatives, the false starts, the disappointments and the dreams which went into making this complex human artifact we call GLCA will prove useful and interesting to those who know and work with us, as well as to those who wish to learn more about the potential for cooperation in higher education.

George N. Rainsford
President, Kalamazoo College
Chairman of the Board, GLCA

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

The Great Lakes Colleges Association was founded in 1961 as a consortium of twelve liberal arts colleges: Albion, Antioch, Denison, DePauw, Earlham, Hope, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Wabash and Wooster. The average age of these institutions is now one hundred thirty-nine years. The oldest, Kenyon, was founded in 1824 and the two youngest, Hope and Wooster, one year after the Civil War ended.

Because GLCA was created as a link between colleges with such long-established traditions, the best approach to understanding the nature of the consortium is to examine the contours of the colleges. Their common origins in a decisive historical period provides the strongest and most enduring element of solidarity among them and determines the nature of the consortium to this day.

The roots of the twelve colleges go deep into the history of the Old Northwest. Generated by the Protestant religious revival that took place in the early decades of the nineteenth century, they came into being in the context of two powerful social thrusts: the movement westward and the mission to people the new land with Christians.

In America of the colonial period and the early years of the republic, the close relationship between religion and education was widely accepted. Most colleges formed at that time were the product of private initiative, largely from ecclesiastical bodies or religious movements. From 1780 to 1829, while eleven universities were founded by states, thirty-one colleges and universities were founded by church groups. As a result largely of this initiative, there are more independent colleges than state-owned ones in the United States.

The clearest expression of the mutually supportive role of religion and education on the American frontier is to be found in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787:

> Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

From the territory created by the Ordinance were later carved the states of Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Wisconsin. The first three of these are now home to the colleges that make up the Great Lakes Colleges Association. In fact, two of the colleges—Kalamazoo and Albion—were founded before the region in which they are located entered the union as the State of Michigan.

The colleges that today make up the GLCA are rooted in the Protestant religious tradition and its concern for moral and academic education.

Religious expressions of this ongoing concern, as it related specifically to the lives of young people growing up on the frontier, are common in church literature. Typical is this excerpt from a report presented to the first meeting of the Indiana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church on October 20, 1832:

> Next to the religion of the Son of God your committee consider the light of science calculated to lessen the sum of human woe and to increase the sum of human happiness. Therefore we are of the opinion that the means of education ought to be placed within the reach of every community in general, so that all may have an opportunity of obtaining an ordinary and necessary education.

On this report were based the decisions that led to establishment of DePauw University.

The early desire to form a trained ministry, which animated many founders of denominational colleges, was often subordinated to the need "to train teachers and other Christian leaders for the boundless most desolate fields in the West," as Oberlin's charter put it. Recognized by many in the founding generation was the importance of extending educational opportunities beyond the boundaries of a supporting denomination. Wabash, for example, though founded by Presbyterian ministers and laymen, declared itself independent of church control from the start; Antioch opened its doors as a non-sectarian college and, to confirm its innovative character, selected as its inaugural president the educational reformer Horace Mann.

Church bonds were not everywhere attenuated. The College of Wooster, whose founding vision was "the promotion of sound learning . . . under religious influences," continues to describe itself as "a college of the church." In the 1960's, the United Presbyterian Synod of Ohio gave the college to its trustees, and relations between the church and the college continue to be regulated by contract. Hope College, the one of the twelve that was perhaps most closely identified with its parent church twenty years ago, retains an organic relationship to the Reformed Church in America, even though the Synod neither sets policy nor holds fiscal responsibility for the college.

The nature of the individual colleges, and of GLCA collectively, is therefore compounded of traditional attitudes as adjusted to modern social forces. Financial contributions by the supporting denominations are almost nonexistent in some cases and fairly substantial in others. In all the colleges, however, a concern for the religious dimension impels a view of the student as a whole person, including moral and spiritual growth.

While the nature of the tie between the colleges and their parent churches varies considerably, all are non-sectarian in their selection of faculty and students. The focus of instruction long ago expanded from religious study to the full range of the humanities and sciences. Having embraced to the fullest the ideal of liberal arts education, the colleges are its champions nationwide.

Another point of identification among the twelve colleges is their situation as academic citadels within small towns. The small denominational colleges were sited over the empty landscape of the Midwest in accordance with the difficulties of transportation and communications that prevailed at the time of their founding. Frontier poverty prevented young people from going back East for their education, and the small local college, because it was accessible and because it filled a real need, early on entrenched itself in the very structure of American life. Today, the college towns are still of very modest size. The largest is Kalamazoo (population 78,000). The other eleven colleges are located in towns having an average population of 12,700, with two of these (Denison and Kenyon) being located in villages of less than four thousand. Geographically isolated, the colleges created and maintained their own intellectual communities. Even today, these colleges are not dependent upon the surrounding towns for their intellectual sustenance, but draw from two deep wells: the cultural matrix that gave them birth, and the professional

GLCA campuses are academic islands situated in small midwestern towns. The serene atmosphere that prevails at these colleges is well illustrated by this photograph of the Denison campus, looking toward Swasey Chapel.

associations of their faculty. With faculty and administrators recruited from the national pool of talent, the intellectual climate on campus responds more to national and international concerns than to regional ones.

None of the colleges depend on their own towns for students. Rather, their recruitment efforts mirror their historical development as modified by availability of financial aid. Ohio colleges are widely perceived as within reach of students from the east coast, and during academic year 1980-81, 80% of Antioch students, 85% of Oberlin students, came from out-of-state. Michigan's generous financial aid policy has operated so as to intensify a trend for Michigan colleges to attract mostly Michigan students. As a result, Hope, which traditionally drew students nationally through the Reformed Church, now has a 70% Michigan student body. Indiana's financial aid policy exercises a similar influence in keeping state students in the state, but Earlham nevertheless continues to attract 75% of its students from out-state.

Transcending their geographic isolation, which enabled them to preserve tradition, the colleges developed distinctive personalities. Antioch has been known for its work-study curriculum since the 1920's; Kalamazoo regularly sends 80-85 percent of its student body overseas for from one to three quarters of study; Oberlin has had close ties with China, particularly with the province of Shaanxi, for close to one hundred years; Earlham's campus is suffused by the Quaker ethos; Kenyon's English department has been home to some of the most influential critics of American literature.

High academic standards and levels of achievement prevail at this group of colleges. SAT scores for 1980-81 averaged 520 for verbal, 552 for math skills. More than half the graduates of GLCA colleges continue on to

Two Nobel laureates in physics were educated at GLCA colleges. Robert A. Millikan earned his BA at Oberlin and subsequently taught physics there; he won the Nobel in 1923. Arthur H. Compton, a graduate of The College of Wooster, won a Nobel in 1927. A high proportion of graduates of GLCA colleges continue to go into careers in science.

BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT GLCA MEMBERS (1980-81)

	Location	Date Founded	Church Affiliation	Faculty[1]	Students[1]	Tuition, Fees, Room and Board	Endowment[4]
Albion	Albion, Michigan	1835	United Methodist	119	1854	$6,487	$16,600,000
Antioch[2]	Yellow Springs, Ohio	1852	Independent	59	800	7,600	4,850,346
Denison	Granville, Ohio	1831	Independent	160	2108	7,060	18,445,669
DePauw	Greencastle, Indiana	1837	United Methodist	154	1250	7,782	36,030,922
Earlham	Richmond, Indiana	1847	Friends	76	1047	6,800	43,890,000
Hope	Holland, Michigan	1866	Independent (Reformed)	146	2228	5,775	5,313,000
Kalamazoo	Kalamazoo, Michigan	1833	Baptist	87	1452	6,747	12,360,411
Kenyon	Gambier, Ohio	1824	Episcopal	106	1450	7,608	8,823,000
Oberlin[3]	Oberlin, Ohio	1833	Independent	175	2171	8,039	93,503,507
Ohio Wesleyan	Delaware, Ohio	1842	United Methodist	171	2273	6,975	17,664,000
Wabash	Crawfordsville, Indiana	1832	Independent	72	790	6,050	60,000,000
Wooster	Wooster, Ohio	1866	Independent (Presbyterian)	146	1754 est.	6,950	23,500,000

[1] Full-time equivalent
[2] Yellow Springs campus
[3] Arts and Sciences only
[4] Book value fiscal year 1979-80

graduate or professional schools. In recent years, an exceptionally high percentage of these students have earned the Ph.D. in the physical and biological sciences. Some degree of this success may be attributed to the small scale of the institutions, ranging from a high of 2273 students at Ohio Wesleyan to a low of 790 at Wabash. The largest faculty numbers 175, the smallest 59. (Although presentation of this data in tabular form implies standardized measurement, strong individual differences among the colleges minimize the relevance of comparative data.)

The atmosphere at these twelve colleges, springing from a philosophical commitment to the liberal arts and nurtured by small campus size, favors teaching. Research is honored among faculty and administrators, but it does not occupy the central position which it does in the multiversities. To the extent that the colleges identify funding for research, this comprises a relatively small percentage of all educational expenditures.

As private institutions, the colleges are sustained primarily by revenues from students, including tuition, fees, and room and board charges. Private gifts and endowment are another major source of current funds; revenues from auxiliary enterprises and government grants (principally for student aid) make up the rest. Over a twenty-year period, state and federal governments contributed increasingly to college revenues, principally in the form of student aid. In addition, the second decade saw major but indirect support in the form of student loan programs.

Perhaps the salient characteristic of the twelve colleges is their innerdirectedness. Grounded in pioneer days and in the certainty of religious faith, this strong sense of self was fostered through decades when religion was becoming secularized and the private colleges seemed to be swimming against a multiversity tide. Their academic strength is manifest in their leadership role in higher education today, as well as in their tradition of autonomy, which was not to be bargained away when the consortium came together. If anything, the colleges lent their independent stance to the consortium that they formed. Paradoxically, the self-reliance of its members became the cornerstone of the consortium.

CHAPTER I

FOUNDING THE CONSORTIUM

Formation of a tri-state consortium of liberal arts colleges was first proposed in 1959 by Landrum Bolling, president of Earlham College. Animating the proposal was the idea that a group of colleges could achieve in common certain academic and administrative goals that they could not achieve alone.

A model for consortial cooperation among small liberal arts colleges already existed in the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, which had been formed in 1958 by ten colleges in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota.[1] Another stimulus to consortial planning was an invitation from the Ford Foundation to representatives of various liberal arts colleges, including Earlham, to attend a conference on undergraduate programs in international education. Evident at this 1958 conference was the increasing importance of institutional cooperation to the future of higher education in America. Shortly thereafter, Earlham and Antioch Colleges undertook joint seminars on Japan, China, and India, funded during three successive summers by a Ford grant. This project in turn became a model for a proposal by twelve colleges which was funded by the same foundation in 1964 in the amount of half a million dollars. By the time that grant was awarded, the Great Lakes Colleges Association had been formed and the value of institutional cooperation confirmed.

Michigan, Ohio, and Indiana formed a natural setting for the new association. President Bolling, together with Samuel Gould, president of Antioch, and Byron Trippet, president of Wabash College, sifted the institutions of higher education in these three states to identify those which they considered congenial. The criteria for selection which were worked out in discussion throughout 1959 are of interest because they reveal the ground on which the colleges originally came together, and on which they have stayed together for twenty years. Although these criteria were never formalized by any legal document, they remain implicit in the ideology and operation of GLCA. This self-selected group shares the following characteristics:

1. Student bodies drawn from a broad cross-section of the nation—geographically, denominationally, economically.

2. Membership in College Board.

3. Whether church-related or not, a serious concern for religious teachings and the cultivation of spiritual as well as intellectual values.

---

[1] Beloit, Carleton, Coe, Cornell, Grinnell, Knox, Lawrence, Monmouth, Ripon, and St. Olaf, since joined by Lake Forest in 1975, Macalester and Colorado in 1969.

4. Independence, whether church-related or not, from narrow church control and financial support.

5. Curricular programs built around a clear devotion to the liberal arts.

6. Involvement in educational experimentation--foreign study programs, undergraduate research, independent study, etc.

7. Intention to limit expansion of student bodies.

8. A level of student charges substantially above those at tax-supported institutions.

These criteria identified colleges which were strongly academic, squarely Christian while independent of congregational control, committed to the liberal arts, open to new ideas, and distinguished from public institutions by the small size of their student bodies and the sources of their income.

The autonomy of each college was mutually agreed on from the start; at no time was consideration given to surrendering to the consortium any authority over campus matters. The principle of each institution's continuing independence was written into the by-laws of the association: "Membership in Great Lakes Colleges Association, Inc. shall in no wise infringe upon the autonomy of any member institution."

To assure the success of the new association, the planners recognized the importance of attracting the most prestigious institutions to the group. But as Oberlin president Robert K. Carr pointed out, each college maintained relationships with other colleges that were not slated to become members of GLCA. Each college was already involved with a variety of state and church associations, athletic leagues, fundraising groups, and national action alliances. Would the new association disturb these useful ties?

Negotiations slowed while the Ohio invitees discussed ways in which their relationships with one another and with other institutions in the state should be worked out. Their conclusion was that the new consortium should be loose enough to accommodate pre-existing and newly established relationships. This principle was written into the by-laws of GLCA and continues to prevail. GLCA is just one strand that ties all the colleges into the complex network of American higher education.

On May 30, 1960, a crucial meeting was held at Jones House on the Earlham campus. Although all twelve presidents of the invited colleges had engaged to attend, David Lockmiller of Ohio Wesleyan was deflected by President Eisenhower, who sent him on a diplomatic mission to Buenos Aires, and Howard Lowry of Wooster was detained by illness. Despite these absences, the original invitees became the charter members of GLCA. Of those invited to join, no college declined; since that time no college has been invited to join. The founders had selected well: a natural fellowship seems to exist among these colleges.

Prefiguring the consortium's concern for substance over form, the first meeting of this as-yet-unorganized association opened with a report on Oberlin's Master of Arts in Teaching program, which had attracted interest at several of the other colleges. The rest of the meeting was given over to a report by Blair Stewart, President of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM), who described that organization's evolution from an athletic league into an academic consortium. At this time, ACM projects included a faculty and student research program in biology, physics, and chemistry at the Argonne Laboratories in Chicago and a joint program to improve the teaching of foreign languages. On the administrative side, a joint analysis of college insurance needs was in progress, as well as an effort to set up a joint biological field station.

The reaction to these presentations being favorable, the decision was made to proceed with forming a new association. Seed money of $1,000 per college was agreed on, and the name Great Lakes College Association adopted.[2] A temporary executive committee was formed, comprised of Presidents Blair Knapp of Denison, Edward Lund of Kenyon, Weimer Hicks of Kalamazoo, and Landrum Bolling of Earlham (two from Ohio, where half the colleges were located, and one each from Michigan and Indiana). Underlying these decisions one detects considerable elan. Sharing the sense that each of them presided over the best college in his geographic area, the presidents also shared the determination to retain that position. Through the new association they sought to continue their leadership role under changing circumstances.

Meeting four months later, the temporary executive committee agreed to bring the association into being by additional steps, the most important of which was to organize a conference of faculty and administrators from each institution. The presidents had established to their own satisfaction that a community of interests existed among themselves; but if the organization was to acquire the necessary vitality, entire college communities would have to be brought into contact with one another.

The organization conference was held on April 16-17, 1961, at the Hopkins Hotel in Cleveland. Interestingly, Landrum Bolling had already convened at Earlham, a month earlier, a conference on "Research in the Natural Sciences in Liberal Arts Colleges," to which faculty from the twelve colleges were invited. This move had the immediate effect of generating enthusiasm for joint projects. The conference urged acquisition of joint computing facilities; an interdisciplinary field station; a laboratory affiliation such as ACM had at Argonne; regular conferences involving science faculty; exchanges of faculty and students; exchange of information concerning library journal holdings; coordination of summer science institutes; and collaboration with universities on in-service teacher training programs. Some of these proposals were subsequently rejected as not feasible, while others were put into operation. The chief impact of the conference at this date was the enlistment of faculty energy in the cause of the consortium. Even though no legal entity had come into existence, this science meeting at Earlham on March 24, 1961 is the point at which GLCA started functioning.

---

[2] Subsequently changed to Great Lakes Colleges Association due to similarity to the name of a pre-existing institution.

The Cleveland organizing meeting which followed in April was the largest gathering to date: 65 faculty and administrators. There was broad representation of the disciplines, with physics, government, philosophy, English, modern languages, history, economics, psychology, music, mathematics, geology, sociology, chemistry all represented. Reflecting the perception that there would be fiscal and management ramifications to the new association, six colleges sent their business managers, and one college sent a delegation comprised totally of administrators (see list).

President James P. Dixon of Antioch articulated the strengths and objectives of the new association:

> It is remarkable that these twelve colleges should have been drawn together, not by any regional necessity, but by recognition of their common concerns as liberal arts institutions. It is remarkable that they should have done this in spite of the danger that they will be charged with elitism, a danger of which they have certainly been aware....
>
> The twelve colleges have not gathered merely to set up a machinery, but to find the shared values, the concerns about higher education which all the colleges hold in common, which will make the Association a real one. The more of these shared values and common concerns we find and the more we agree on their importance, the stronger the Association will be.
>
> Since as individual colleges we are already concerned with these problems, the objective of the Association is not so much to superimpose something on what we are already doing as to find ways in which the programs and the educational devices within the institutions can be joined together, ways in which we can tap the creative forces within the individual colleges, making them useful to all the colleges concerned.

The minutes of the meeting make clear that this creative potential was given substance by bringing together complementary personnel from the twelve colleges: dozens of proposals were made for taking advantage of the vastly expanded possibilities opened up by the pooling of resources and students. Even the presidents, self-possessed as they might be, acknowledged the need for a support network, as in this memo drafted by three of them:

Organizational Conference, April 16-17, 1961
Cleveland, Ohio

GREAT LAKES COLLEGES ASSOCIATION

College Representatives

Albion College

Louis W. Norris, President
Herbert H. Wood, Dean
Audrey K. Wilder, Dean of Women
Paul R. Trautman, Business Manager
Walter B. Sprandel, Dean of Men

Antioch College

James Dixon, President
W. Boyd Alexander, Dean of Faculty
J. D. Dawson, Dean of Students
Samuel Baskin, Director of Research
Albert B. Stewart, Physics
John Sparks, Government
Keith McGary, Philosophy

Denison University

A. Blair Knapp, President
A. J. Johnson, Business Manager
Paul Bennett, English
C. W. Steele, Modern Languages
G. R. Norris, Biology
John Huckaby, History

DePauw University

Russell J. Humbert, President
William R. McIntyre, Sociology
Clark F. Norton, Political Science
Charles L. Beiber, Geology

Earlham College

Landrum R. Bolling, President
William Fuson, Sociology
Lewis Hoskins, History
William Stephenson, Biology
Harold Cope, Business Manager
Laurence Strong, Chemistry

Hope College

John Hollenbach, Vice President
William VanderLugt, Dean of College
Dwight Yntema, Economics
Ezra Gearhart, German
Kenneth Weller, Asst. to President

Kalamazoo College

Weimer K. Hicks, President
Laurence Barrett, Dean of Faculty
S. H. Simpson, Business Manager
Donald W. VanLiere, Psychology
Peter Boyd-Bowman, Foreign Languages

Kenyon College

Frank Bailey, Dean
Raymond English, Political Science
Denham Sutcliffe, English
Daniel Finkbeiner, Mathematics
Edwin J. Robinson, Jr., Biology
Paul M. Titus, Economics

Oberlin College

Robert K. Carr, President
William F. Hellmuth, Dean
Fenner Douglass, Music
Thurston E. Manning, Provost
John Kneller, French

Ohio Wesleyan University

David A. Lockmiller, President
Noel Johnston, Vice President
Robert Meyer, Business Manager
Ronald R. Greene, Psychology
Robert L. Wilson, Mathematics

Wabash College

B. K. Trippet, President
B. A. Rogge, Dean
William Bates Degitz, Business Manager
P. S. Wilder, Jr., Political Science
Stephen G. Kurtz, History
Lewis S. Salter, Jr., Physics

The College of Wooster

Howard F. Lowry, President
H.W. Taeusch, Dean
Rodney S. Williams, Sec. of the College
Robert S. Cope, Registrar and Admissions
E. Kingman Eberhart, Economics

> Very few, even among brand-new presidents, know so much about this fascinating, limitless, overwhelming, exhilarating task that they cannot learn more about how it should be done. They can probably learn more from each other than from anyone else.

At this same Cleveland meeting, the presidents assembled for the first time as the Board of Directors, (with vice president John Hollenbach sitting in for president Irwin Lubbers of Hope). A slate of officers was elected, consisting of:

Chairman	Landrum Bolling
Vice-Chairman	James P. Dixon
Secretary-Treasurer	Weimer K. Hicks
Executive Committee	Robert K. Carr Louis W. Norris Byron K. Trippet

The Board adopted an operating budget of $42,000 and approved equal assessments on each college. Cleveland was favored as the location of association headquarters, but the final decision was delayed pending appointment of a president.[3] In order to carry out cooperative ventures, the Board agreed to support conferences on the various campuses for faculty and administrative officers, and requested the academic deans to inventory special resources in such areas as foreign study grants for faculty and audio-visual materials. In a move that foreshadowed the intensely self-critical nature of the consortium, the Board agreed that after a three-year period the organization, activities, accomplishments, and membership would be reviewed by the Board of Directors.

In the authority they gave the consortium, the presidents conservatively agreed that the main tasks of their colleges were, and would remain, on their own campuses, among their own constituencies, and within the framework of existing educational programs. The consortium would occupy only the periphery of each college's concerns, linking their efforts to maintain quality academic programs and justifying its own existence through the sharing of administrative cost and experience. The colleges had survived for a century and a half without such cooperation, but times were changing.

The argument for change was perhaps best expressed by Sidney Tickton, representative of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, who participated in the Cleveland conference.

---

[3] In fact, the first headquarters was established at Detroit Metropolitan Airport, and subsequently moved to Ann Arbor.

> Five main factors are to be considered when it comes to planning for the future. Although in regard to none of them are the predictions absolutely precise, there is no escaping the general trends nor the fact that these trends are going to determine what we do. These five factors are the rapid increase in the birthrate, the increase in the desire to go to college, the increase in the number of students qualified to go to college, the shifting center of education from privately supported to tax supported institutions, and the increase in faculty salaries.

Privately endowed colleges were being affected by economic and social conditions that were beyond the control of any individual college. The environment in which the colleges function—the economy, the torrent of social change—has increasingly impinged upon them, making cooperation seem an increasingly necessary strategy for coping, continuing to survive, and continuing to excel.

GLCA was incorporated under the laws of the State of Michigan on August 2, 1962. According to its by-laws, the members of the corporation are the twelve founding colleges. Governance is by a Board of Directors consisting of the presidents of the member institutions.[4] Authority in the interim between biannual Board meetings is vested in the Executive Committee consisting of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, Secretary-Treasurer, and at least two other Directors elected annually by the full Board. The Executive Committee is required to have at least one representative from each of the three states in which member institutions are located (the weighting of Ohio was dropped).

The Board hires an association president to take responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the consortium. Serving at the pleasure of the Board, the president is responsible for providing the principal leadership in fulfilling the association's purposes. Preparing the basis for cooperation necessary to carry out consortial activities, he investigates new potentials for cooperation and takes the lead in formulating specific proposals to the Board of Directors. He engages in a continuing review of all activities of the association in order to maintain and improve those which continue to be worth while and to propose termination of activities that are not longer needed. The president bears principal responsibility for sound management of the business affairs of the association, and represents GLCA both internally and vis-a-vis other individuals, institutions, and associations. Since 1968, he has had a vice president to assist him in these responsibilities.

---

[4] Amended in 1975 to include the chairman of the Deans' Council and three faculty members.

The GLCA Board, meeting at the College of Wooster in 1965. Front Row: *Eldon Johnson, President of GLCA; Louis W. Norris, Albion; James P. Dixon, Antioch; A. Blair Knapp, Denison; Weimer K. Hicks, Kalamazoo.* Back Row: *Robert K. Carr, Oberlin; Landrum R. Bolling, Earlham; Elden T. Smith, Ohio Wesleyan; Howard Lowry, College of Wooster; Warren Shearer, representing Wabash; William E. Kerstetter, DePauw.* Not shown: *F. Edward Lund, Kenyon; and Calvin A. Vander Werf, Hope.*

The title of president places the chief executive officer on a par with Board members. However, unlike the presidents of the colleges, he is not chief executive of an educational institution. The entire staff of the GLCA office has varied in size from two to six, including secretarial support, and the GLCA president is not directly responsible for administering any educational program.

Consortia in higher education are frequently compared with the United Nations: members retain their sovereignty and yield selectively to the organization only those functions which they believe will enhance their own capacity to carry out their stated missions. If this analogy is accurate, then the president of the association may fairly be likened to a secretary-general, a role which calls for sensitivity to the complex political nuances within and between member institutions, and great caution in approaching any issue which might be viewed as threatening to the integrity of individual members.

In seeking its first president, the Board had to break new ground. The consortium was new, untried, and needed an experienced administrator at the helm. At the same time, few administrators had had experience with consortia. Therefore, the search committee concentrated its efforts on finding a chief executive with pronounced skill in the area of negotiation and conciliation. Sensitive to the interests of the varied constituents who made up the GLCA, the president would have to be deft at weaving them into a network strong enough to sustain coherent programs. In an association of twelve "sovereign" colleges, action could be taken only by mutual agreement. Furthermore, this agreement could not be forced. The twelve had not come together out of necessity but out of common concerns. These became the source for consensus, which became the GLCA's habitual method of decision-making. It takes a sensitive ear to determine where consensus lies, and a skilled hand to weld consensus into action.

For its inaugural president, the Board selected Eldon Lee Johnson, president of the University of New Hampshire. Trained as a political scientist, Johnson had had considerable administrative experience with the United States Department of Agriculture and the University of Oregon before moving to New Hampshire. As consultant to the Universities of Nigeria, Trinidad, and Malawi, he had also gained wide experience in international education. These international interests served GLCA well, for it was during the period of his presidency that its first overseas programs were established. Johnson served four and a half years before leaving GLCA to accept a position as vice president of the University of Illinois.

Although each successive GLCA president has been possessed of a unique personality and has developed a distinctive style of working with the Board, the success of each is confirmed by his long term in office. In two decades, GLCA has had just three presidents and one acting president. Five men have served as vice president.

GLCA Presidents	
1961-66	Eldon Lee Johnson
1967-73	Henry A. Acres
1973-74	Laurence Barrett
1974-	Jon W. Fuller

GLCA Vice Presidents	
1968-69	Charles Glassick
1971-72	William Petrek
1973-76	Joe E. Rogers
1976-81	Donn Neal
1981-	Neil Wylie

From this brief resume, it can be seen that many important questions concerning the nature of the consortium were not addressed at the outset. Rather, they were left for time and events to define. Three of these questions might be asked here, in order that they may be seen to inform the consortial activities that took place in the next two decades. The answers to these questions are embedded in the organic development of GLCA.

The association was clearly designed to be peripheral to the colleges. But was it to be a system of ligatures binding the colleges together, or a "thirteenth institution" with a financial base of its own and perhaps even a graduate degree program? At one time or another, GLCA has been defined in both these contradictory ways.

The second question has to do with the locus of decision-making. In any confederation of sovereign bodies, it is problematic where ultimate authority will come to rest. Who was to have the power to bind all twelve colleges to a decision? No answer was attempted while the association was being formed. Rather, it was left to time and evolution to produce a balance between center and periphery.

The third question—whose organization was this to be?—was also not determined at the start. GLCA originated within a coterie of college presidents. Was it to remain a presidents' club, or were other members of the college communities—deans, faculty, business officers, students—to have a say in its governance? To borrow a theme from larger issues of governance: in a voluntary association of autonomous institutions governed by a board of directors, each one of whom is responsible to different sets of constituencies (his board of trustees, college faculty, administrators, students, alumni) who gets what, when, and why?

What, then, did the founders expect the consortium to achieve? For some, the new association represented an instrument by means of which these liberal arts colleges could support and defend quality education. For others, GLCA was a business proposition: there were broad opportunities to share administrative experience and to effect economies of scale. Still others hoped GLCA would form an athletic league among schools of comparable size and shared values; yet others looked toward expanding such dimensions as foreign study or science research facilities which colleges could not manage on their own. Not to be discounted either is the camaraderie which quickly grew up among the presidents: clearly, they enjoyed one another's company. All the founders were persuaded that the new and rapidly changing political and social conditions in which the colleges found themselves (the country was about to traverse the volatile sixties) required the development of new responses. All these motivations were expressed during the discussion leading up to the founding of GLCA.

Founded in a time of great educational elan, GLCA evolved during a historical period when educational resources and population were expanding. A generation later, those conditions are reversed. Perhaps the most intriguing question posed by this history is, how well can an organization founded in bouyant times withstand the stresses of inflation, declining student population, and retrenchment?

CHAPTER II

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

The validity of the consortial idea was tested by the multitude of programs undertaken in the ensuing twenty years. There existed no master plan: consortial programs grew without reference to any blueprint. It can be seen now that they fell into six categories: international education, including the establishment of overseas study centers; thematic off-campus study programs in the United States; faculty development; legislative representation; women's studies; and administrative data exchange. Each of these programs emerged from the expressed needs of students, faculty, or administrators. Each was linked to the social, scientific, or political events that conditioned higher education in the sixties and seventies. Developed simultaneously, overlapping, or succeeding one another chronologically, the programs generally emphasized these six themes in the order in which they are treated here. Despite shifts of emphasis, and despite substantial evolutionary change, all six types of program won permanent places on the GLCA agenda. The result has been expansion of the range of activities the consortium undertakes and enrichment of the environment in which learning and teaching take place on GLCA campuses.

The initial programmatic thrust was toward internationalization of the curriculum. The decision to suffuse the liberal arts with an international perspective evidenced the continuing vitality of these colleges with their roots in the landlocked Midwest, and their intellectual vigor in responding to the needs of their students. As various as the approaches to the subject were, they can be subsumed under two major categories: preparation of faculty to integrate cross-cultural materials and perceptions into the courses they taught, and introduction of students to foreign cultures through well designed study programs overseas.

Eight of the twelve colleges already had overseas study programs in operation; four of these, in fact—Antioch, Oberlin, Kalamazoo, and Earlham—had several running simultaneously. The others had campus directors of overseas study to help students find programs organized by universities or by other consortia. All felt the limitation of their own resources, however, and an inability to supply the desired range of overseas opportunities, particularly in the relatively neglected non-Western areas. It was also felt that, if faculty were to provide the intellectual leadership that was needed in order to expand the international dimensions of their campuses, they needed opportunities to reinforce their knowledge of non-Western cultures. As Eldon Johnson wrote in proposing that the Ford Foundation fund such a plan, "Our purpose is to go beyond individual college efforts and to take measures to assure an impact on our undergraduates which is impossible without the broader expectations of joint planning, the stimulation of a larger academic community, the contagion of shared experimentation, and the impetus of special funds."

The Ford Grant

The approach to the Ford Foundation was the first major effort by GLCA to obtain outside funding for its programs. The one-half million dollar grant which was awarded in 1964 generated considerable elan within the new association and helped to establish non-Western Studies as one of its primary concerns.

Over a three-year period, this grant supported a series of workshops and seminars on the religions of Asia; Chinese language study at Oberlin and Wabash, and Hindi at Wooster; and visits by foreign faculty to GLCA campuses. Research projects of 75 faculty members were also supported for periods of from two weeks to fifteen months. The projects were as imaginative as they were varied. A. Denis Baly (Kenyon) pursued his field research 30,000 miles through the historical geography of Turkey, Iran, Jordan, Iraq, and Lebanon. John Peterson (Kalamazoo) recorded oral traditions in Sierra Leone. Richard Peeler (DePauw) produced a film on the making of Japanese ceramics. The impact of these fellowships was perhaps best summarized by Oberlin Provost John W. Kneller.

> First, several grants to Oberlin faculty enabled them to introduce or improve courses entirely devoted to non-Western studies. For example, a grant to Oberlin's first teacher of Chinese language and literature enabled him to go to Taiwan, his first visit to an area where Chinese is the native language. On this trip, he obtained materials not available in the United States which have been used directly in the course. . . .
>
> Second, other grants made it possible for faculty members who were not non-Western specialists to develop competence to include non-Western topics and materials into their regular courses. . . .
>
> Third, the availability of the non-Western faculty fellowships was an important factor in recruiting and retaining faculty members with non-Western interests. . . .
>
> The Ford funds were also valuable to Oberlin in the development of competence of the professional librarians in acquisition, cataloguing, and general policy for non-Western materials.

Almost a third of the grants were awarded for East Asian Studies, with Latin America running second and Africa third. Funds were also awarded for comparative studies and for the study of the USSR, Middle East, and Southeast Asia. The wide distribution of grants enabled faculty members to integrate non-Western materials into the curriculum and oriented entire institutions to acceptance of international education as an integral element of undergraduate education. So much momentum developed that, following expiration of the grant, many activities stimulated by it were continued by the colleges and by individual faculty members. Also established was a style of decentralized operation for the consortium: most of the administrative costs were reimbursed to the colleges which sustained the initiative of the program, and the only salary charged against the grant was for the newly-created Coordinator of International Education, who remained a member of the Earlham faculty.

Obtaining the Ford grant established the bona fides of the Great Lakes Colleges Association. It came to be seen as an entity capable of generating resources, dissolving fears that it might become a drain on its members' resources. In time, government agencies as well as private foundations were to come to see GLCA as a reliable channel for putting money into quality higher education. While GLCA never developed into the "thirteenth institution" which Eldon Johnson occasionally envisaged, it did, with the Ford grant, establish itself as an active agent capable of attracting funds that might not have been accessible to the individual colleges acting on their own.

Establishing Overseas Programs

Meanwhile, developments overseas moved ahead faster than developments at home. The January 1964 Board meeting authorized establishment of overseas study programs in Bogota, Tokyo, and Beirut, for all of which the spadework had already been done. It was at this meeting that the office of International Education Coordinator was established, and Jackson Bailey, professor of Japanese history at Earlham, appointed to it. Antioch was appointed agent college for Bogota, and Earlham for Tokyo. The Near East program, sought at first by both Kenyon and Wooster, was placed under the stewardship of GLCA and shortly transferred to Kenyon. By December of the same year, several more programs were formalized. Irwin Abrams (History, Antioch) had devised a student seminar in Yugoslavia, and had it approved by the Board; The College of Wooster had made a successful bid to start up a program in India; Oberlin and Wabash had expressed their determination to establish Chinese area and language centers; and DePauw, Kalamazoo and Ohio Wesleyan were vying for programs in Africa. As further demonstration of the measure of the organization's vitality during this period, the December 1964 Board also authorized a marine biology program, established the position of science coordinator, initiated postdoctoral teaching internships, and approved a project in programmed instruction. While these projects, scattered over the curriculum, lacked the cumulative impact of the international studies programs, Eldon Johnson calculated that GLCA domestic programs were receiving more funds, and spending more funds, than international ones.

During the first few years, the bulk of the International Education Coordinator's time was devoted to administering the Ford Fellowships and bringing together GLCA sociologists, political scientists, librarians, and deans for the professional conferences authorized by the grant. Bailey reported that coordination of overseas programs constituted a significant but minor part of his responsibilities.

This situation was to change. When the Ford grant expired, the Board signaled its intention to continue supporting international education by making permanent the position of coordinator. To this post they appointed Irwin Abrams and arranged for two-thirds of his salary to be paid by assessment of the members.

It was largely Abrams' vision, his understanding of the postwar world and the need of students and faculty members to immerse themselves in it, that sparked the expansion of international education.

The Task Force on International Education

When he became Coordinator of International Education, Abrams formed a Task Force of faculty members, all of them experienced in the conduct of foreign programs, to assess the state of international education at GLCA colleges and develop proposals for funding under the newly-enacted International Education Act.[1] Between October 1967 and March 1968, they inventoried resources at each of the colleges, conducted team visits to each campus, and arranged consultations among faculty engaged in research and teaching on the various geographic areas. Their conclusions: the current state of international education was good, but it had not yet reached its full potential. To achieve this, the team recommended a series of steps intended, in their word, to "revolutionize" the college curriculum.

At the time the report was written, there were already approximately 100 GLCA students in four consortial programs (Japan, Lebanon, Latin America, and Yugoslavia), and another 700 or so in programs sponsored by the individual colleges or other institutions. On GLCA campuses during the 1966-67 academic year, there had been 5,600 enrollments in more than 290 courses dealing in substantive ways with international education.

The Task Force identified some specific difficulties with the ways in which these courses and programs were managed. Chief among these was the inability of students to integrate their foreign experience with on-campus learning. There seemed to be no comprehensive approach to international education that took in the universe of academic and experiential learning, on campus and off.The Task Force's recommendations aimed at mobilizing consortial energies to intervene in areas of weakness and to generate campus wide efforts at genuine internationalization of the curriculum. Recommendations ranged from the very broad (that GLCA seek financial support for research in international education) to the very specific (that an exchange be established with the Academy of Music of Ljubljana). Proposals were made for a faculty seminar on contemporary Germany (which was held), and for a Denison-Oberlin agency in Russian studies (which did not develop). Most sensibly, the Task Force recommended that the programs sponsored in Europe by the individual colleges be coordinated.

---

1. Members of the committee, which was chaired by Louis Brakeman (then chair of the Political Science Department at Denison), were Paul B. Arnold (Oberlin), Paul G. Fried (Hope), Robert H. Goodhand (Kenyon), Barrett Hollister (Antioch), Lewis M. Hoskins (Earlham), Bernard E. Manker, Jr. (Wabash), Frank O. Miller (Wooster), John E. Peterson (Kalamazoo), William J. Petrek (DePauw), Herbert Probasco (Oberlin), Janet E. Ragatz (Ohio Wesleyan), and James C. Waltz (Albion).

In terms of its impact on the consortium, the major recommendation of the Task Force was articulation of an ideal model for the agent college. The Task Force argued that the agent should not only administer the consortial program but also, building on its competence and experience, become a resource center for the other colleges. At home, agents should develop sufficient depth in resources so that they could offer courses to students from the other colleges and provide support to faculty in the form of library materials and visiting scholars. Abroad, the agent might establish a multipurpose center able to serve the needs of students and faculty visiting that area. Through these developments, the agent could become a catalyst, encouraging sister colleges to re-examine traditional programs, supporting experimentation and diversity.

The International Education Act was never funded, but the Task Force itself proved to be an important element in the process of consortium building. Whereas the earlier Ford grants had invested in what was called the "private sector" of faculty brains, the Task Force, with its emphasis on an internationalized curriculum, set about suffusing the "public sector" of campus life with a world view. It is true that the full extent of its recommendations concerning the agent college were never implemented. But in 1981, when the Bogota agency was bid for, the criteria imposed on the prospective agent were very like those set forth by the Task Force thirteen years earlier.

The greatly condensed accounts of GLCA programs which follow are intended not as definitive histories of these programs but as indicators of the scope of the consortium. There were large ways in which these programs succeeded, but there were defeats as well. Taken together, they illustrate the organic way in which the consortium grew and developed.

The Bogota Program

A feasibility study for operation of a GLCA program somewhere in South America was authorized by the Board in 1962 and carried out by Raymond L. Gorden (Sociology, Antioch), who had set up Antioch's own program in Guanajuato, Mexico. The Board's choice of Colombia was prompted by several circumstances: the Spanish spoken there is standard; Colombia, though removed from the United States, is within easy distance of it; and good relations prevailed between the governments of the two countries. Within Colombia, Bogota was the logical site since more than half of the country's educational resources are located in the capital.

In line with the emerging pattern of decentralization, the Board asked Antioch to become agent college, and the program was launched in the summer of 1964, a bare six months after the go-ahead. In keeping with the stated preference of the planning committee that study in South America not be restricted to an elite group of students who had studied Spanish for many years, the program offered a wide range of academic subjects to students at three stages of language competence. Those with no college Spanish were enrolled at Guanajuato for a summer term. Those with some language preparation entered the Centro de Estudios Universitarios Colombo-Americano (CEUCA) which GLCA established in Bogota. Students with fluent Spanish could enroll either at CEUCA or at one of the three major universities in Bogota. In the first semester 24 students from 10 GLCA colleges enrolled at CEUCA; the cost to them—including round-trip transportation to Mexico and/or Colombia—was no greater than for study on their home campuses.

After some peregrination, CEUCA came to rest in a former residence in the central business area of Bogota. CEUCA now includes classrooms, offices, a library of 3000 volumes, a student lounge and cafeteria, study areas, and a garden. Until its discontinuance in 1981, CEUCA en el Campo offered an arts and recreation center in a small town outside the capital city.

CEUCA's staff consists of a director, a housing coordinator, registrar, fiscal officer, librarian and various support personnel. In any one semester, there are one or two full-time faculty members and about ten university faculty who are hired to teach part-time as needed. (Most professors teaching in Colombian universities do not work full time at any one institution, but divide their time among several.) Enrollment by CEUCA students at the National University did not work out as well as hoped because political turmoil brought about the sporadic closing of the campus. For Colombian students, political action was an important part of their socialization; for North American students, strikes and lockouts were a disruption of their education leading to a loss of credits toward graduation. In response, CEUCA began offering a wider range of courses on its own premises, a trend which was reinforced when the Universidad de los Andes, the most favored of the universities because of its long history of cooperation with US institutions, began charging the program $75 per student per course. From 15 to 20 courses in the humanities are now offered each semester at CEUCA, and most students choose courses from its curriculum.

It was apparent from the start that having a center such as CEUCA created the inherent risk of isolating students from Colombian life, so that they would experience a variant of United States college life rather than immersion in a foreign culture. To minimize this risk, students are housed with Colombian families, an element of the program generally viewed as positive despite complaints regarding monotonous diets of rice and fried bananas. Identified by Colombian personnel at CEUCA, families receive an allowance to cover the students' board and room. Placements with families who enjoy having the students in their homes have worked better than with families who need the income. Although students thus suffer the disadvantage of remaining in a middle class environment, nonetheless the experience does provide them the opportunity to rub the edges off their ethnocentrism without experiencing grave culture shock.

CEUCA has developed as a meeting place of two cultures. Its first director was Julian Nava, a Harvard Ph.D. on leave from his history position at San Fernando Valley State College. John W. Martin, who succeeded him, was founder of the Instituto Linguistico Colombo-Americano and was responsible for introducing the teaching of English as a Foreign Language at CEUCA. His successor, Albert R. McAhron, who was married to a Colombian, had worked with the Peace Corps in Chile. Director for the past seven years has been

Jose Ismael Marquez, a Colombian of Cuban origin who obtained his doctorate at the University of Kentucky and, before joining CEUCA, taught at the Universidad de Los Andes.

From the Antioch side, Ray Gorden served as the first administrator, followed by Dorothy Hiatt—Mother Hiatt to her numerous charges who benefited enormously from her advice on what to do and what not to do as a guest in Colombia. On Hiatt's retirement, the position was taken by John Cranshaw.

During the seventies, CEUCA was enrolling from 120 to 150 students, about evenly divided between GLCA and non-GLCA colleges. As the decade drew to a close, steeply rising costs combined with the destabilization of Colombian politics to undermine student recruitment and the program's future. Within Colombia, political kidnappings and assassinations made the enterprise seem hazardous. In the United States, financial difficulties at Antioch raised questions concerning the viability of their overseas programs. Having passed through a period of retrenchment, the college no longer had an academic base for Latin American studies, nor was there prospect of re-establishing one. Further, while Antioch was agent for two overseas programs (Bogota and European Urban Term), other GLCA colleges had no agency responsibilities and were interested in acquiring one.

The CEUCA staff in 1979. Ismael Marquez and John Cranshaw in the back row; Stella Restrepo, housing coordinator, is second from the left.

In August 1979, Fuller raised the issue of transferring the agency for Bogota to another GLCA college. The question of legal ownership now came to the fore; there was a longstanding Board policy to the effect that the agent college was presumptive owner of the property of an off-campus program. Bogota had been Antioch's from the start, and some Antioch faculty and administratiors wanted to retain it. Eventually, agreement was reached to put the agency up for bids. DePauw, Kenyon, Wooster, and Antioch itself all developed proposals for revitalized Bogota program, and the Board awarded it to Kenyon. Charles Piano, professor of Spanish at Kenyon, took on responsibility for the program;

John Cranshaw moved from Yellow Springs to Gambier to continue in his position as administrator. The program continues to operate and to attract students in languages, sociology, and political science.

American University of Beirut

The GLCA Near Eastern program at the American University of Beirut (AUB) was in many ways the easiest to establish. Paradoxically, the very circumstances which led to its selection as the site for a GLCA program were those which led to its dismantling eleven years later.

In July of 1962, Landrum Bolling paid exploratory visits to Roberts College in Istanbul, American University in Cairo, and the American University of Beirut, settling on the latter as the most congenial location. For decades, AUB had been training government, business, and professional elites for the entire Near East. Founded in 1868, the university represented, in Bolling's view, "one of the finest results of the American missionary thrust of the mid-nineteenth century." Because of its long association with the United States and the fact that classes were taught in English, AUB offered a congenial environment for GLCA students; yet it was one that brought them into daily contact with the Lebanese and Arabic cultures.

An agreement negotiated with the University by President Eldon Johnson enabled GLCA to place up to 25 students a year at AUB, beginning in the Fall of 1964. (Later, a limit of ten "girls" was imposed within this number.) In addition, GLCA students were placed at the Beirut College for Women and the Near East School of Theology, bringing the annual contingents to about thirty. Students enrolled in regular classes, and were encouraged to take courses, such as Arabic language and culture, which they could not get on their home campuses. They enrolled at AUB during their junior year, living in dormitories with Lebanese or with other foreign students. An orientation period at the mountain village of Shemlan enabled them to taste the quality of Lebanese rural life as well as that of cosmopolitan Beirut. This and other imaginative features of the program were made possible by program associates Erica and Peter Dodd, AUB faculty members.

GLCA faculty members serving as resident coordinators were an important element in making the program at home in Beirut, and also provided faculty development opportunities for the individuals selected. Coordinators shared their time between counselling students and teaching at AUB. Those who held the position included:

1964-65	Joseph D. Coppock (Economics, Earlham)
1965-66	John Hollenbach (Vice President, Hope)
1966-67	Maurice Branch (Economics, Albion)
1967-68	Anthony Bing (English, Kenyon)
1968-69	Anthony Bing and Sherrill Cleland (Economics, Kalamazoo)
1969-70	Robert Goodhand (Modern Languages, Kenyon)
1970-71	Victor Ayoub (Anthropology, Antioch)
1971-72	Melvin Vulgamore (Religion, Ohio Wesleyan)
1972-73	Saad E. M. Ibrahim (Sociology, DePauw)
1973-75	Albert and Ruth Stewart (Physics and Financial Aid, Antioch)

Kenyon was made agent for the program, with Paul M. Titus, Edmund Hecht, and Donald E. Reed each serving as administrator for periods of several years. The Beirut program also had the benefit of an unusually strong support group in its advisory committee, which consisted of five or so faculty members designated from compatible teaching areas in the twelve colleges. The committee scrutinized student applications, kept itself aware of the quality of course offerings, and constituted a vocal lobby within the consortium.

Throughout the lifetime of the program, there was warm appreciation of the special circumstances in which it operated and which imposed a requirement of conformity: GLCA students were guests of a university that was itself a guest in the country. To a greater extent than at other locations, students were continuously warned that they must conform to Lebanese societal expectations with respect to drug abuse, relations between the sexes, and the Arab-Israeli confrontation. As Paul Titus put it in a 1967 report on the status of the program:

> It is important that we do our best . . . . to accept only students who will accept and adapt to the social requirements of AUB and the Near East. Continuance of the program by AUB will turn on our success in this matter. It should be understood that GLCA colleges and students are benefited much more by the Near East Program than is AUB. . . . With this in mind, we must do everything possible to send only students who will behave in terms of AUB standards and requirements.

The Six-Day War caused the evacuation of all American students and staff. The program resumed the following year, but persistent student strikes shut down the university for days or weeks at a time. Academic credit for courses that were truncated or terminated—not to mention the safety of students—seemed increasingly in jeopardy. One reaction by GLCA was to tighten its requirements for admission to the program, excluding students who might cause problems. The extent to which the program's administrators were willing to impose conformity emerges from a meeting of the Near East Advisory Committee held in Ann Arbor on 4 December 1970, with Terrry Prothro, Dean of AUB, also in attendance. The minutes of the meeting read in [illegible]art:

> The American University of Beirut was chosen in part because it was an institution whose admissions standards and principles were consonent (sic) with those of GLCA colleges, specifically prohibiting racial or religious discrimination, and because Lebanon has been the most open of all the Middle Eastern countries in the face of tensions that have marked the Arab-Israeli conflict.
>
> In the past three years, as these tensions have grown, the stance of the country has begun to shift. The AUB catalog still states, however, that students of all faiths are welcome, whether Muslim, Christian or Jewish. It is an institution incorporated under the laws of New York, which forbid discrimination. Last year there were more than a dozen students of declared Jewish background enrolled at AUB. . . . It seems, therefore, that it cannot be stated that either the university or the country has a

> policy that denies admission on the basis of religion or racial background. At the same time there are obviously strong feelings on political positions growing out of the Arab-Israeli conflict, and any foreigner entering the country or the university must recognize what he faces by virtue of his being identified as a member of another nation or group.
>
> The GLCA Program in Beirut faces continually the overall problem of trying to assess the current dangers that American students face today in attending a college in a Middle-Eastern country, especially since in Arab eyes the USA is closely identified with the Israeli position. So far the GLCA has decided to accept the risk, even though there is some danger. Much depends on effective counseling and wise screening. Any American student with a strong Zionist bias would probably be *persona non grata* in a Lebanese university, just as an American student with a strong Fatah bias would be unwelcome or suspect in an Israeli university. Further, an American student of Jewish ancestry, despite his openness and genuine interest in reaching an understanding of the Arab People and their beliefs, might be uncomfortable in a university in an Arab country during the current wave of high feeling. In fact the university might, under certain circumstances, deny such a student entrance because it fears for his safety. . . . The Committee, however, believes that this factor alone should not lead to a cancellation of the present GLCA Program. Its cross-cultural values are real, and after eight years of careful designing and testing, a Program of great significance has been developed for GLCA students.

Students applied to the program through Kenyon: after a preliminary screening by the advisory committee, applications were forwarded to AUB. On occasion, Jewish students who had been rejected were unable to obtain reasons for their exclusion or to assign responsibility for the decision. On November 8, 1971, the Kenyon faculty passed a motion which "deplored the discrimination in Beirut against certain students and faculty members because of religion, race, and political views." Although the written record is unclear, the inference is that discrimination was in fact practiced against Jewish students, as well as against women who would not promise to subordinate themselves to Muslim mores.

Despite the effort to conform to AUB norms, the program found itself increasingly under attack. The more permissive social life of the Americans led some Lebanese to assume that students were involved in illicit activities of all kinds, from drug dealing to political activism, although individual GLCA students were cleared of such charges on several occasions. Where once AUB had seemed a rock of stability on an island of reason within the maelstrom of the Near East, now, with political conditions deteriorating throughout the area, the university could not remain unaffected. Struggling to maintain its neutrality, it was wracked by student disorders during which the presence of American students became an issue. A dean who was friendly to GLCA was taken hostage and ultimately murdered. Several moves to curtail the GLCA program were averted, but in 1975 it was finally suspended. The descent of Lebanon into civil war had led to the withdrawal of applications for the program and created a financial crisis which could not be overcome at a time when the dollar was undergoing severe devaluation. Under these circumstances, Kenyon Provost Bruce Haywood could not in good conscience recommend the Beirut experience to his students any longer, and raised with Jon Fuller the necessity of closing it out. This point of view carried against that of the Middle East Advisory Committee,[2] many of whose members favored continuing the program. The enthusiasm of committed faculty kept alive for several more years the hope of reactivating the program. This hope was dashed in an informal meeting between Donn Neal, GLCA Vice President, and the new President of AUB when the latter reacted negatively to a suggestion that conversation on the matter be opened. The program was officially terminated in 1980.

East Asian Studies

One of the most important spin-offs of the Ford Foundation-sponsored non-Western Program was the establishment of language and area centers at GLCA colleges. Ultimately, with the aid of federal funds, three such centers came into being: two for East Asia (one with a China emphasis at Oberlin, the other with a Japan emphasis at Earlham); and one for Latin America at Antioch.

When it became evident that federal funds for these language and area centers would not be renewed, it was decided to attempt to establish a consortially-sponsored center. This came into being in 1973, when Oberlin and Earlham joined to establish the GLCA Center of East Asian Studies under a three-year grant of $380,000 from the Lilly Endowment.

Operating under guidelines set by a GLCA Center Policy Committee composed of faculty members from the constituent colleges, the Center promoted the teaching of Chinese and Japanese (today, Chinese is taught at Albion, Denison, Earlham, Kalamazoo, and Oberlin; Japanese at Antioch, Earlham, Kalamazoo, and Oberlin); sharing of teaching resources already in place on member campuses; acquisition and distribution of instructional materials on East Asia (including development of a film library, provision of teaching modules and videotape and cassette units dealing with specific topics in East Asian Studies); acquisition of titles for placement in members' libraries; and circulation of artistic and cultural exhibits and programs dealing with East Asia. Community outreach was also a feature of Center activities, including services to local public schools.

The single most important program activity of the Center was to provide development grants for faculty on the model of the Ford grant. A small committee of faculty members administered the program, and in three rounds awarded a total of $24,808 in 29 grants for projects ranging from research at a university library to the planning of a major curriculum revision in general education to include a substantial component on Chinese civilization. As a result of this program substantive curricular change occurred at several member institutions.

---

[2] The committee had adopted the somewhat broader term, Middle East, to replace the earlier Near East.

The Center staff made themselves available for consultation and to coordinate efforts of faculty at the other GLCA colleges to carry through programs in East Asia studies. For example, a seminar in Asian art was held at Denison University; summer courses for high school teachers and department of education students were held at DePauw; a course in Asian film, developed at Albion College, was shared with Kalamazoo and Hope. The largest programmatic effort was support for a special curriculum during Oberlin's January term which revolved around Asian theatre and dance one year, and Chinese science the next. Each of these programs was a response to local initiative and represented support for felt needs.

The admininstrative awkwardness of having a "center" that was based on two colleges separated from one another by 250 miles and maintained by two different administrations was bridged by naming one director (Jackson Bailey) and two associates (Diana Battista at Earlham and Halsey Beemer at Oberlin). The most demanding challenge was to devise an administrative structure that could meet the needs of all the member colleges while continuing to support the resources already in place at Oberlin and Earlham, and without which other program activity would not be possible. The continued concentration of Chinese studies at Oberlin and Japanese studies at Earlham plainly served the second purpose better than the first; yet, without the strengths of Oberlin and Earlham, the program would not have existed at all. The Center represented a compromise between existing opportunity and administrative efficiency.

With the end of its outside funding, the GLCA Center for East Asian Studies lapsed. However, during its three-year life span, it had advanced toward achievement of its goals. Faculty grants, seminars, and outreach activities had enriched the curriculum of many of the colleges, as well as the life of the towns in which the colleges are located. Some Center programs became models for other institutions around the country. Nationally, GLCA was enabled to speak with a voice of authority on the subject of international education, making representations to Congress, to the Office of Education, to foundations, and within national associations. The prestige which accrued to the Center was a factor in strengthening the Japan Studies program of GLCA, which continues to this day.

Japan

This program, which is based in Tokyo, was an outgrowth of Earlham-Antioch collaboration. In 1961-62, a series of joint faculty seminars and exchanges funded by the Ford Foundation broadened into efforts to find ways of getting faculty to Japan. Bailey made an exploratory trip to Japan to prepare a summer seminar for faculty there, and to bring a Japanese language instructor to the Earlham campus. Edwin Reischauer, then United States ambassador to Japan, suggested the possibility of a connection with Waseda University, which was then just starting up its international division. The following summer, Bailey and President Bolling of Earlham visited Waseda for the purpose of drafting an agreement between their two institutions; a year later, the first students (from Earlham, Antioch, and Kalamazoo) were enrolled at Waseda. A faculty exchange was also built into the agreement. In 1964, as we have seen, the GLCA Board designated Earlham as agent college for Japan and asked Bailey to broaden the program so as to make it available to all students and faculty in the consortium. This program is still in existence.

Japanese language is not required for acceptance into Japan Studies, but each student must complete two semester hours of the language before departure for overseas. (Earlham offers an intensive course in June for students who cannot study Japanese on their home campuses.) In Japan, the program begins with a July orientation period during which students visit Tokyo, attend a two-week intensive seminar in Japanese language held at a mountain resort, and spend three weeks working in the countryside while living with farm families.

During the academic year, students live with Japanese families in Tokyo and take classes at Waseda. Further language study is required, but most instruction at the International Division of the University is in English. A GLCA or ACM faculty member serves as resident director and a Japanese program associate assists students at the University.

An important part of the program is the provision for Japanese exchange students and professors to study and teach at GLCA campuses. One Waseda faculty member and about two dozen Waseda students are at ACM and GLCA colleges each year.

At a special convocation at Earlham College in April 1980, Japanese Consul General Yoshinao Odaka congratulates ACM and GLCA officials following announcement of a one-half-million-dollar grant in support of Japanese studies. From left; Dan Martin (President, ACM), Inman Fox (President, Knox College and ACM Chairman), Consul Odaka, Jon Fuller (President, GLCA) and Franklin Wallin (President, Earlham College). Seated between Fuller and Wallin is Landrum Bolling, who initiated the program when he was president of Earlham.

For some years, GLCA and ACM each sponsored separate undergraduate programs at Waseda. The two programs were obliged to unite in order to survive rapid fluctuations in the exchange rate such as were experienced in 1977-78, when the program was almost forced to close. What was needed was a steady margin of endowment-generated income. The President of GLCA took the initiative in securing a three-to-one matching grant of $125,000 from the National Endowment for the Humanities. Subsequently, the Japanese Government, through its distributing agent, The Japan Foundation, provided matching funds in the amount of $500,000. The program has also received substantial financial support from Japanese firms having active business interests in the Midwest. In fact, it was Japanese business executives, organized as the Chuseibukai, who took the initiative in recommending and supporting the half-million dollar endowment grant proffered by the Japanese Government.

The concept of endowing an off-campus program was a new and troublesome one for GLCA. As agent for the Japan program, Earlham retains fiscal responsibility, with sixty percent of income applied toward maintenance of base resources (including promotion of Japanese studies elsewhere than in the Japan Studies Program) and forty percent allocated to programming for the other 24 GLCA and ACM campuses. An advisory committee sets guidelines and oversees the program. Responsibility rests with the director, subject to programmatic advice from the advisory committee (formed by faculty members from three ACM and three GLCA colleges, and the vice presidents of the two consortia), oversight by the budget review committee, and the mandate of the combined Boards of Directors.

The ACM/GLCA program, emphasizing as it does contemporary Japanese culture and society, has produced a substantial number of graduates who retain a working interest in that country. Of the nearly five hundred former participants from the twenty-five colleges plus an additional sixty from other institutions who have taken part in the program since 1963, two-thirds have returned to Japan to visit or work. One-third have taken advanced professional training related to Japan in business, education or law. More than a third have taken jobs related to Japan in the United States—at Japanese consulates in major US cities and for such firms as Mitsui Bank of New York—or have joined American companies doing business in the Orient, such as the Chase Manhattan Bank in Osaka, the First National Bank of Boston in Seoul, and Standard Oil Company in Tokyo.

In addition, a large number of faculty members from a wide range of disciplines have had the opportunity for an in-depth experience of Japan while serving as resident director.

Resident Directors
Waseda University Program

1963-64	Joseph Whitney (Geography, Earlham)
1964-65	Frank O. Miller (Political Science, Wooster)
1965-66	John Foxen (Philosophy, DePauw)
1966-67	Arthur Little (Dramatic Art, Earlham)

1967-68	Robert M. Montgomery (Religion, Ohio Wesleyan)
1968-69	Richard Wood (Philosophy, Earlham)
1969-70	Roy Morey (Political Science, Denison)
1970-71	Cyrus Banning (Philosophy, Kenyon)
1971-72	Edmund Samuel (Biology, Antioch)
1972-73	David Clark (History, Hope)
1973-74	Richard Wood (Philosophy, Earlham)
1974-75	Elizabeth Hayford (Assistant Dean for International Education, Oberlin)

GLCA/ACM

1975-76	Charles Cleaver (English & American Studies, Grinnell)
1976-77	Edward Ypma (Psychology, DePauw)
1977-78	John Butt (Religious Studies, Macalester)
1978-79	Stephen Heiny (Classics, Earlham)
1979-80	Ronald McLaren (Philosophy, Kenyon)
1980-81	Robert Drexler (English, Coe)
1981-82	Brenda Bankart (Psychology, Wabash)

The longevity of the Japan program, the extent of student and faculty involvement, and its success in cultivating a lifelong concern for Japan-U.S. relations, all combine to build substantial credibility for GLCA in its dealings with Federal programs concerned with the funding of educational programs in international education.

Yugoslavia and Poland

A program of student encounters in Yugoslavia in the style of Quaker international student seminars was the brainchild of Irwin Abrams. Convinced of the necessity of bringing students from the GLCA colleges into contact with the socialist world, he approached the State Department with his idea in 1962. The plan met with encouragement, but took another two years to be launched with P.L. 480 ("counterpart") funds. In its first phase, GLCA and the University of Ljubljana cooperated in a series of student seminars on comparative aspects of American and Yugoslav society. The American participants, honor students selected and aided financially by their colleges, were accompanied by four GLCA professors. A certain imbalance arose at first from the inability of the Ljubljana students to visit the United States; furthermore, since the seminars were conducted in English, the Yugoslavs were at a disadvantage. This was remedied by enabling Yugoslav students to enroll in GLCA colleges as exchange students. A total of 91 American students participated in the summer seminars in the years before 1970, when the focus shifted to faculty development.

In offering GLCA faculty the opportunity to live and study in Yugoslavia, the motivation was not to produce Yugoslav experts, but to encourage integration into the curriculum of knowledge concerning Eastern Europe and thus contribute to greater campus awareness of eastern bloc culture, politics, and economics. A total of 73 faculty members visited Yugoslavia between 1965 and 1972.

Many of them developed a comparative dimension to their teaching, particularly faculty members with an interest in urban studies who were able to utilize Yugoslav cities for comparative purposes. Others published articles in professional journals which grew out of their research in Yugoslavia; while still others enriched campus life in such ways as staging a production of "A Midsummer Night's Dream" with Yugoslav folk dances and costumes.

The Yugoslav program was placed by the Board under the agency of Hope College. In assuming responsibility, Hope did not propose to undergird the program by strengthening its own curriculum in East European studies in the way Earlham had for Japan. Rather, its motivation was to open windows on a Marxist country and expose some faculty members to winds from the east.

The Yugoslav-American Seminar at Groblje during the summer of 1965. Irwin Abrams, International Education Coordinator, is standing in the center of the rear row; behind him to his right is John Hollenbach, one of the founders of GLCA.

Faculty sought out for the seminars were generally older, well-established professors who would have an impact on their campuses. They tended to rotate on and off the advisory committee which, in customary fashion, was comprised of five or six faculty members teaching courses related to the subject area. Hope's contribution to the program was an institutional commitment to its goals.

When Irwin Abrams scouted Eastern Europe in 1963 in search of faculty opportunities, he visited Poland also but was unable to make a connection there. Returning in 1972, he met with encouragement and consequently took a group there the following autumn. At that time, he began planning for a full-fledged faculty seminar on urban planning to be held in Poland, but this collapsed because of the difficulty of getting travel reservations during the year when Poland observed the five hundredth anniversary of the birth of Copernicus.

Support funds, flight reservations, planning, and faculty all came together in 1974 when, with the aid of US Office of Education funds, a faculty seminar on "Social Change in the Urban Environment" was held in Poland. A group of twelve faculty members led by Joseph Zikmund (Political Science, Albion) participated in a study tour that took them to nearly a dozen Polish cities, where they met with urban planners and practitioners and studied the nature of urban planning in a socialist economy. Faculty members also worked on their own research projects, the results of which were presented at a conference held at Antioch on their return. Though judged successful, the seminar was not repeated because funds were not available the following year.

The Yugoslavia program also came to an end due to the loss of government funding in 1972 and the inability of the colleges to sustain it without outside support. However, two programs—one in Yugoslavia and another partially based on that country—developed subsequently, drawing heavily on the resources and contacts developed during the original student seminars.

The idea of placing students once more in Yugoslavia for an entire semester was revived in 1977 by J. Patrick Haithcox, then vice president of ACM. Together with a joint ACM/GLCA faculty committee that included graduates of GLCA's earlier program—notably, Bruce Bigelow of Denison's history department—Haithcox and Donn Neal worked out plans for a Yugoslav semester that were approved by the ACM Board of Directors and by the GLCA Board in December of the following year.

Now in its third year, the Yugoslav program begins with a late August orientation in Zagreb, followed by two academic sessions of six and nine weeks. The first is devoted to language study and to a course on Yugoslav history and culture that is taught by the resident director. The second corresponds to the University of Zagreb's fall semester. Students take several courses taught in English by regular university professors (Marxist Foundations of Yugoslavia; Worker Self-Management System, etc.). During both sessions, field trips to surrounding regions are integrated with classwork. Students live with local families to the extent that the program is able to make placements, and are encouraged to take part in the life of the local community.

It was originally planned that the resident director would be recruited from among faculty at ACM and GLCA colleges, but the necessity of finding a suitable faculty member who was also a speaker of Serbo-Croatian restricted the choice of directors: only the first came from inside the consortia while the following two were recruited from farther afield.

Michael Petrovich (History, Hope) is himself a spinoff of the original Yugoslavia program, having been hired after meeting GLCA personnel while acting as State Department interpreter for the rector of Novi Sad University in 1965 on a visit to Antioch and Hope that grew out of the GLCA joint seminars at Ljubljana. While at Hope, Petrovich established a Dubrovnik summer seminar for the college, and it was he who was chosen to initiate the consortial Yugoslav program in 1979. Thomas Emmert, a Balkan historian on the faculty of Gustavus Adolphus College, was director the second year, followed by William March of the University of Kansas. The program's advisory committee is made up of three faculty members and the vice president of each consortium.

In its initial years, the program suffered the expected—and some unexpected—problems. Student dissatisfaction with living arrangements, unanticipated delays in transmittal of funds, misunderstandings with the University of Zagreb, and discontinuity of personnel on the scene were the major problems. As in any overseas program, the position of academic coordinator (a local faculty member with an understanding of the program's needs) proved to be crucial. The current coordinator, Milan Mesic, docent in sociology, made a major contribution to the program in his first week on the job by finding the Americans a permanent classroom and office space. This program is administered from the Chicago office of ACM.

European Urban Term

The European Urban Term grew out of an effort by Irwin Abrams to build out of GLCA resources in Philadelphia, Ljubljana, Bogota, Tokyo, and Madurai a program of comparative urban research and study. The existence of GLCA outposts in cities around the globe seemed to provide an excellent opportunity to enlist the talents of faculty members across the disciplines and through them to galvanize urban studies on the campuses. At this time, The College of Wooster had a functioning urban studies program, but most of the other colleges did not. And of course, none of them could offer the spectacular multinational features which Abrams envisioned.

Orchestrating all these programs, however, proved impossible, since each already had its own agenda. As an alternative, a separate program of urban studies was started up upon a dual base: the faculty seminars in Yugoslavia (discussed above), and a joint Antioch-Grail Urban Problems Seminar held at the Grail International Center near Amsterdam in which Antioch was a participant. Utilizing contacts developed during the course of these programs, Abrams designed the European Urban Term (EUT), scouted out the European logistics, and served as its first resident director.

As presently constituted, EUT takes students through three European countries: England, one eastern bloc nation (Yugoslavia or Poland), and one other urbanized country such as Sweden or the Netherlands, offering the opportunity for direct field observation in different cultural settings. Students' experiences are examined critically through reading assignments, lectures, and group discussion. An organizing theme is selected by each year's director, usually related to the contrasting ways in which different types of societies plan and construct their habitats.

Abrams designed EUT as an opportunity for students to encounter a foreign culture by participating in it. At the same time, he insisted that experience must be analyzed if it is to produce learning. An academic director (generally a young teacher who shows promise of remaining a permanent GLCA faculty member) acts as facilitator, organizer, and stimulus and may also lecture on the history and culture of the area being visited. But since the faculty member cannot have direct knowledge of all the cities visited, guest lecturers are [illegible]n from local universities, city councils, chambers of commerce, business, [illegible] government bureaus. In this way, students gain a broad introductory [illegible]edge of cities in general and specific cities in particular, and are helped [illegible]velop the analytic skills necessary for independent study.

This study, occupying the final third of the course, is undertaken in London. Topics chosen for research in recent years have included housing patterns in Covent Garden, the development of community social and legal services to battered wives, and the effects of the power structure on the transportation systems of Amsterdam and London.

Each year EUT introduces approximately 30 American students to the life of European cities. Simultaneously, the faculty member selected to lead the program acquires considerable opportunity for professional development. The directorship has been described by David Barclay (History, Kalamazoo) as a "multifaceted development experience," in that the director has the freedom to draw on individual disciplinary strengths to introduce innovation into the curriculum. Interpersonal skills also get a good workout as the director is responsible for shepherding 30 undergraduates across the map of Europe in a complex series of logistical maneuvers. As a reward, the director gets to spend time on individual research while in London during the independent study period. There is no doubt that the directorship of this particular program would be even more popular than it is were it not for the usually insuperable problem of financing a three-month stay in Europe for the director's family. The post has been occupied by:

1972 - Irwin Abrams
1973 - Irwin Abrams
1974 - Irwin Abrams/James Caplinger (former City Manager of Kalamazoo)
1975 - Irwin Abrams/Elaine Comegys (Associate Director, Antioch Cooperative Education Program)
1976 - Richard Fusch (Geography, Ohio Wesleyan University)
1977 - George Galster (Economics, Wooster)
1978 - William Bonifield (Economics, Wabash)
1979 - David E. Barclay (History, Kalamazoo College)
1980 - Amir Rafat (Sociology, DePauw)
1981 - John Macionis (Sociology, Kenyon)

As a result of Abrams' initiative and of pre-existing Antioch programs abroad, Antioch was made agent for EUT. Headquartered in Yellow Springs at the office of Antioch International, the program is now administered by Dean Paula Spier, assisted by Mark Kasoff of Antioch's economics department. Its strong advisory committee, with eight colleges represented, includes many faculty members who are "graduates" of the Beirut and Yugoslav programs, as well as student alumni of EUT. The program now sponsors an annual GLCA conference on urban studies.

Madurai

The GLCA study program in the south Indian city of Madurai was launched in 1969 with Wooster as agent college. Wooster's association with India reaches back to 1932, when students initiated a program to sponsor recent Wooster graduates to teach at Ewing Christian College in Allahabad. From 1961, Indian studies became a part of the Wooster curriculum, with course offerings in economics, history, philosophy, political science, and religion, as well as major purchases of India materials for the college library.

Under the GLCA programs, the spring quarter at Wooster was devoted to intensive study of the Tamil language, together with an approved set of courses and a research project under supervision of coordinator Walter Andersen of the Wooster faculty. At the University of Madurai, students enrolled for intensive Tamil language instruction, courses in Indian civilization, and a directed study.

The Madurai program, like that in Beirut, fell afoul of political currents. The understandable desire of the Indian government to control the educational process at its universities led first to abolition of the post of resident director, and then, in 1972, to the cutoff of visas for students and educators. As a result, the Madurai program was suspended for two academic years. Although it proved possible to resume the program with an altered format, it once more came to a halt in April 1975 with the stoppage of P.L. 480 funds to United States undergraduate programs in India.

At this juncture, an offer of cooperation was received from the University of Wisconsin, which was operating study sites in Varanasi and Waltair: Wisconsin would add Madurai to its management responsibilities, while GLCA would co-sponsor all three programs, with access to them for its own students. This plan overcame the financial, personnel, curriculum, and housing problems that had hindered the Madurai operation, and the programs have operated jointly ever since. GLCA students may also join ACM's program, which is based on the University of Poona.

The lapse of the Madurai program is clearly attributable to political factors that were beyond the control of Wooster and that permeated Indo-American relations during the period under consideration. Language was also a factor; for the small number of GLCA students with an interest in India, Hindi was clearly a more useful language than Tamil. Further, the effort to establish the program was largely the initiative of one faculty member; when he resigned, interest flagged and the Department of Indian Studies was dissolved. An awareness of Indian culture remains on the Wooster campus, with various courses offered and an annual Wooster-in-India dinner. But, lacking the critical element of faculty commitment, the program lapsed as a GLCA initiative and survives as an opportunity that is available outside the GLCA orbit for interested students.

Aberdeen

The GLCA Scotland program provides a full year of study at the five-hundred-year-old University of Aberdeen. The University's traditional liberal arts curriculum offers GLCA students a wide variety of courses, including the natural sciences, and some courses unique to British universities. Living in dormitories, participating in Scottish sports and extra-curricular activities, students become part of campus life for the year. One of the strengths of the program is that students are not segregated: so few Americans attend

Aberdeen that GLCA students become part of the community almost from the moment of arrival. In the words of William Placher (Philosophy and Religion, Wabash), a former student in the program and now its director, "Aberdeen provides a good place for a student looking for a rather traditional education in a very Scottish place, with a chance to get inside Scottish culture. It serves less well students who are impatient with traditional forms of academic education, students looking for a truly international university, or students unwilling to accept a certain isolation from the bright lights of London."

Antioch, agent for the program from its inception in 1963 until 1978, has now turned over its administration to Wabash, which seems peculiarly well matched to Aberdeen. The two institutions share a traditional educational philosophy and a pattern of drawing their students from conservative rural areas. The chief problem in recent years has stemmed from external factors beyond the program's control: the decision of the British government to raise drastically the tuition charged foreign students. Nevertheless, in the academic year 1981-82, the Scotland program enrolled 16 students.

Africa

Kalamazoo College has the largest African foreign study program for undergraduates in the United States. Its first African study center opened in 1962 at Fourah Bay College of the University of Sierra Leone, a small liberal arts institution founded in 1827 (and thus even older than "K"). Three years later, a second center was opened at the national University of Kenya in Nairobi. Since that time, as part of the comprehensive K Plan under which a majority of students spend several quarters abroad in study centers on every continent, Kalamazoo has added five more such centers in Africa: at Njala University College in Sierra Leone, Cuttington University College in Liberia, the University of Ife in Nigeria, the University of Dakar in Senegal, and the University of Ghana at Legon.

The GLCA Board, acting in May, 1966, designated Kalamazoo the official GLCA agent college for English-speaking Africa south of the Sahara. (At the same time, DePauw was designated GLCA agent for French-speaking Africa. This program was closed out in 1974 when low enrollment left the program with an operating deficit of more than $10,000.)

Kalamazoo remains the official agent college for Africa, but the program has no fiscal connection with GLCA and is administered, together with a wide array of other foreign study options, by Joe K. Fugate, Kalamazoo's Director of Foreign Studies.

Israel

Proposals for a GLCA program in Israel were long deflected by two circumstances: the existence of many non-GLCA programs in that country which students were free to attend; and fear that an Israel initiative would jeopardize the Beirut program. But when President William Caples of Kenyon reported officially the continuing de facto exclusion of Jewish students from the Beirut program, the Board at its Fall 1970 meeting authorized exploration of a GLCA program in Israel. Discussions with universities in that country led Oberlin College to propose that it be named agent. Oberlin's initiative was approved by the International Education Committee in February 1971, and by the Board a month later.

H. Thomas Frank of Oberlin's Religion Department undertook to negotiate an arrangement that would attract both students with a cultural tie to Israel, and others with no such tie, and to integrate them all into Israeli life to the extent possible. As it evolved, the program consisted of a two-month ulpan for intensive study of Hebrew, a full academic year at a university (with courses in both Hebrew and English), special seminars, lectures, and tours of the country. Students had the option of living in dormitories or private apartments, or with families.

Originally, the program was to be based on Haifa University, which seemed to offer the best facility. Unexpectedly canceled by Haifa just before it was to begin, the entire program had to be transferred on short notice to Hebrew University in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, it got underway that summer.

1972 proved a poor year, however, for starting up a new program in the Middle East. Fears of traveling to the area made it impossible to overcome the usual hesitancies at joining a program during its shakedown years. As a result, and despite Oberlin's willingness to carry a temporary deficit, by the third year, dwindling enrollment made it impossible to carry the program any longer and it was suspended for the 1974-75 academic year. Efforts to resume an Israel program by establishing a relationship with Ben Gurion University in Beersheva during 1981 fell through, but GLCA in Israel remains suspended, not canceled.

China

In 1975, there were two Chinese language programs on Taiwan that were open to GLCA students. One, administered by Oberlin, was for students who had already completed two years of college-level Chinese language instruction. The other, run by the California State International Program at Taipei, admitted GLCA students with no previous language training.

In October of that year, at the initiative of Patrick Haithcox of ACM, faculty members of both consortia met to discuss the possibilities for joint off-campus Chinese studies. At this meeting, GLCA was represented by vice president Joe Rogers, Halsey Beemer (GLCA Coordinator for Chinese Studies), Robina Quale, chair of the China Advisory Committee, and Dale Johnson, director of Oberlin-in-Taiwan and also director of the GLCA China program.

As the People's Republic of China had not yet indicated willingness to admit foreign students and there was no certainty that it ever would, the options discussed were Taiwan and Hong Kong. The former was favored as having superior facilities for language teaching and a supportive social and cultural environment, as well as by the ACM/GLCA preference for Mandarin over Cantonese (the dialect of Hong Kong).

Four months later, however, the possibility of locating in Hong Kong was reopened in a memo from Halsey Beemer describing the proposed Yale-in-China Program at Chinese University. Despite the non-traditional nature of Chinese society in the British Crown colony, its commercial atmosphere, and the fact that the language differed from that of the centers of power on the mainland, there were nevertheless advantages to joining this particular program. Chinese University in Hong Kong (CUHK) was church-related; it was an amalgam of three colleges that were lineal descendents of campuses existing on the mainland before liberation. Some still preserved their pre-revolutionary ties, as was the case with Yale and New Asia College. As a result, CUHK was encouraging Yale to develop an International Asian Studies Program on its campus.

Yale looked like a strong contender for GLCA affilation, but before any program could begin, there were obstacles—such as the provision of dormitory space—to be overcome. In the interim, Halsey Beemer corresponded with institutions on Taiwan in order to identify a good match for GLCA in that area, and the ACM/GLCA committee considered supporting off-campus programs at both locations. However, the GLCA Center for East Asian Studies Policy Board recommended Hong Kong over Taiwan because of greater student interest in the culture and politics of contemporary China and the conviction that these could better be studied in Hong Kong than on Taiwan.

The consortial approach decided on at that time was that Chinese studies form an integral part of a liberal arts education and that entrance into a program should be possible for a broad range of students (i.e., there would not be a difficult language requirement). Language was to be taught as a means of access to Chinese culture, rather than as a tool for area studies or pre-professional training.

The outcome of these continuing discussions (the China advisory committee was meeting three times a year, with many informal discussions in between) was a joint ACM/GLCA Chinese Language and Culture Program Proposal which became the basis of discussions carried on in the summer of 1974 by Dean Elizabeth Hayford and Professor Charles Hayford of Oberlin, on the one hand, and representatives of New Asia College of CUHK on the other. The Hayfords, who had been in Japan while Elizabeth served as resident director of the Japan Studies program, visited Hong Kong to negotiate for direct access by ACM/GLCA to CUHK. The actual outcome was indirect affiliation with the University through the Center for International Programs of Beaver College/Franklin and Marshall College. This indirect affiliation was partly the result of happenstance, and partly a reflection of the mood of the advisory committee, which opposed developing too great a stake in a program off the mainland. By affiliating indirectly to CUHK, GLCA could be seen as "making do" and thus was less likely to compromise its acceptability to the Peoples' Republic of China if the time should ever come when American students were welcome there.

The ACM/GLCA program at CUHK, launched in the summer of 1975, offered required courses in Mandarin, Chinese studies, and electives chosen from the regular courses of the University (one quarter of which were taught in English). Students were housed with Chinese students in dormitories on campus. After one year, the Yale-China program having become established, ACM/GLCA moved over to that group.

An evaluation of the Hong Kong program, carried out in 1979 by a faculty team headed by Frank Wong (Academic Dean, Antioch), found that it had successfully passed through its improvisational beginning and become firmly established within the Chinese University. Given the organizational complexity at the Chinese end, centralized administration in the United States, through the ACM office, was a major advantage. Yale-China's legitimacy within the University, stemming from its long relationship and financial support, was likewise of benefit to the program.

Some aspects of the program, however, were weak. Academically, the most serious problem was the frustration of students over being unable to use their Mandarin language training in their immediate surroundings; most resolved the dilemma partially by taking a crash course in Cantonese. But the most insoluble problems related to administrative arrangements. ACM/GLCA had no formal voice in the formulation of Yale-China policy, while Yale-China in turn occupied an ill-defined place within the University. Participation in policy-making was especially important since the parties had different perceptions as to the goals of the program: ACM/GLCA wished to keep the program open to liberal arts undergraduates generally, while Yale-China increasingly favored language and area training for pre-professionals. As time passed, disagreement also grew up over the desire of ACM/GLCA to retain a certain number of reserved places in the program for their own students, and also to place an ACM/GLCA faculty member as resident coordinator. This situation was eased during the three-year tenure of the Hayfords in Hong Kong while Charles served as representative of Yale-in-China and associate director of CUHK's international program. As former members of the Oberlin faculty, they were able to ease potential strains within the alliance. However, they could do nothing to open up the faculty development spots which have always been a prized aspect of the overseas programs of both ACM and GLCA.

During 1979, the relationship between ACM/GLCA and Yale-China was becoming increasingly problematic, causing GLCA to turn to yet another China connection. This was found in the Council on International Education Exchange (CIEE), which was then making arrangements for American students to enter Fudan University in Shanghai. With Lewis Hoskins (Earlham) as chair of the CIEE planning group; Barry Keenan (Denison) the official CIEE representative to the People's Republic of China; and Donn Neal (GLCA vice president)—along with Hoskins—on the CIEE board of directors, the consortium was well-placed to influence the structure and content of the new program.

The administrative history of the China program is unusually complex. Each of the two consortia represented a dozen institutions, each with its own priorities, personalities, and requirements. On the other side of the globe, ACM/GLCA's relationships to their host universities were unavoidably filtered through intermediaries, resulting in ambiguous administrative arrangements that required continuous fine tuning. It was necessary to gear into, first, the Beaver/Franklin and Marshall Center, itself representative of several competing interests and headquartered in Glenside, Pennsylvania; and then into Yale-China, headquartered in New Haven, Connecticut. The five-year agreement ultimately reached with CIEE promises greater stability for the program, but if experience is any guide, administration will continue to be complex and ambiguous. It is remarkable that evaluations show a quality education being delivered throughout these years.

In the larger view, efforts to establish and maintain a viable China program were constrained by the relations prevailing between Taiwan, Hong Kong, the United States, and the People's Republic of China. Throughout most of this period there was no means of communication with the PRC. Competing with the desire to avoid blocking any channel of communication that might appear was the equally strong desire not to let a generation of students go without some exposure to Chinese culture. The result was continuing debate, the forming and reforming of programs at different sites, and a general appearance of disarray attributable to the political forces that circumscribed the options.

In selecting those options that were to be utilized, the colleges divided over the question of whether to regard a China program as an intensive language experience directed toward producing professional sinologists (the opinion championed by Oberlin, the only college in the two consortia equipped to teach Chinese at an advanced level); or whether to regard it as one element in the design of a superior liberal arts education (the opinion held by faculty members from the other colleges). Though the division was not always that neat, those who held the first view tended to favor Taiwan; those favoring the second, Hong Kong. Debating these views no doubt slowed the evolution of a program, but they reflected genuine differences of opinion as to the legitimate function of the program and needed to be fought out. The gap between the two sides appeared to be closing with the planned move to the mainland, where both goals can be pursued through alternate curricula.

Summary and Analysis

In the decade 1971-81, between 1200 and 1400 students from GLCA campuses enrolled in GLCA or joint GLCA/ACM international study programs. Bogota, with 600 of these, is far and away the largest program, followed by Africa and European Urban term, each with more than 200 students over the past decade, while each of the other programs have had fewer than one hundred. All the programs but Bogota are now operating in the black.

The principle of administration by an agent college rather than by a central office staff, adopted by the Board as early as October 1963, has been adhered to consistently. Probably no other single decision was as crucial to the development of the consortium, because it dictated the evolution of GLCA as a system of ligatures between the twelve colleges, not as a control system over them. Had it been decided that the consortium itself would administer off-campus programs, the size and authority of the GLCA central office would have grown steadily. Instead, the agency plan kept the GLCA staff small by allowing the consortium to piggyback on existing financial and international education personnel at the colleges. Decentralization has remained the rule throughout the years as the number of consortial responsibilities increased, despite the risk that successful programs tend to become the "property" of the colleges running them, a tendency that is counteracted by consortium-wide selection for advisory committees and by the overall authority of the Board.[3]

GLCA's administrative style presents an interesting contrast to that of ACM, whose Chicago office does administer consortial off-campus programs. With thirteen colleges, eight overseas and seven domestic off-campus programs, ACM's staff in 1981 numbered fourteen compared with GLCA's total of not quite six positions (both including secretarial and support). The Board's stated intent to limit development of a GLCA bureaucracy was built in when the agent college model was adopted. On the other hand, GLCA's decentralized model is partially dependent on ACM's centralized one: three programs with complex logistics are administered by ACM on behalf of the two consortia.

Also determined at the start was the pattern of selecting as agent the home institution of the most interested faculty member. In other words, designation as agent college did not depend upon existence of substantial curricular or faculty resources in a subject related to the program to be administered, but rather on an institutional willingness to back its own faculty member. It was apparently felt that the college which was prepared to put risk capital into a new venture dreamed up by one of its own was the one most likely to be willing to put its resources toward managing the venture once it got off the ground.

That kind of administrative commitment was not available in equal shares on all the campuses. The drawback, obviously—and this was to become apparent in later years with regard to the Madurai and Bogota programs—was that a slight shift in resources within the agent college away from the relevant field of interest or loss of one or two involved faculty members would lead to erosion of the resource base and loss of the program's credibility.

Most of these programs came into existence because a particular faculty member made connections with a foreign campus, which generally proved to be not unlike the colleges that comprised GLCA. The idiosyncratic appearance of some of these contacts seems actually to have been the result of a selection mechanism, since all parties shared an enthusiasm for high academic standards. At the same time, an unspoken assumption remains that these standards cannot be defined with the same rigor as on the home campuses. Limitations of language and problems of acculturation exert a drag on the students' ability to learn as well as on the local professors' ability to teach. These same factors, however, create optimal conditions for experiential learning—learning how to learn from one's environment. This premise is basic to support for

---

3. A description of the agency system of program management is to be found in Chapter VI.

foreign study. A minority of GLCA faculty continue to take the position that off-campus study must meet identically high academic standards in the most formal sense, be it at the cost of experiential learning. But GLCA overseas programs have flourished because of a conviction shared by most faculty members and administrators that study while living in a foreign culture is an important part of a liberal arts education. Although the historic roots of foreign connections at some of the colleges lay in the missionary movement, the context in which consortial programs of foreign study evolved is entirely secular.

At a 1976 conference, President Richard Rosser (DePauw) identified the difficulties that stood in the way of continued internationalization of the curriculum. There was a growing isolationist spirit in society at large, which was naturally reflected on the campuses; and a new conservatism among students, who tended increasingly to focus on vocational preparation. While the needs of students for a world perspective were actually greater than ever, there was increasing difficulty financing American study overseas at a time when the dollar was slipping vis a vis foreign currencies.

The environment for international education has deteriorated further since Rosser made these observations. While GLCA maintains a broad range of quality study abroad options in Africa, China, Latin America, Yugoslavia, Japan, India, Scotland, and the European Urban Term, international education is no longer the major thrust of the consortium.

CHAPTER III

THEMATIC OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

After the first five years of strong GLCA commitment to international education, a change of emphasis began to emerge by academic year 1966-67. As the nation became attuned to domestic rather than to international concerns, the city with its problems and its challenges moved to center stage. More and more, a need was felt to open up GLCA's small campus worlds to expose students to the social, scientific, and artistic currents of contemporary American life. But realistically, how could these colleges, with their origins in white rural America, respond to the challenge of urban decay and black anger? How could they, with their limited resource base, prepare students to engage in scientific research for which the most sophisticated laboratories are required? How could minuscule art departments, no matter how talented their faculty, expose students to the entire range of artistic creativity?

Once more, consortial cooperation offered some solutions. The Board of Trustees, meeting in May 1967, approved proposals for two programs—the Philadelphia Urban Semester and New York Arts Program—each designed to engage students in the life of the city, the former in sociological terms, the latter in artistic modes. Later, an Oak Ridge Science Semester was added, as well as the Newberry Library Program in the Humanities. Marine biology and wilderness programs rounded out the thematic off-campus programs offered by the consortium.

At the same meeting at which this significant turn was taken, the Board appointed a new GLCA president. Henry A. Acres was the forty-one-year-old assistant president of Hofstra University. He had helped design the experimental New College there and had put into operation various cooperative programs between Hofstra and Adelphi University. Acres was to guide GLCA for the next six years through the expansion of domestic off-campus study programs.

Philadelphia Urban Semester

The Philadelphia program differed from other GLCA projects in that it was motivated not only by the desire to enrich the colleges' curriculum, but also by an impulse for social activism. James Dixon, who as president of Antioch initiated the idea, had previously been Philadelphia's Commissioner of Health under reform Mayor Richardson Dilworth. Now that Dilworth was president of the Philadelphia school board, the program could be developed with the active collaboration of the school superintendent, Mark Shedd. It enlisted Acres' enthusiasm as well, and one of his earliest acts was to ask Robert DeHaan, chair of the Psychology and Education Department at Hope College, to head a committee to negotiate an agreement for cooperation between GLCA and the Philadelphia school district.

DeHaan became resident director of the program after it was authorized, and in that position oriented the program toward social activism and experiential education. His vision was equal to the task. In a letter to a Philadelphia school administrator, he spoke of the "need for an army of specially trained and unusually competent teachers for ghetto schools. . . . We need. . . compensatory education for ghetto children, . . . new curricula need to be devised, new methods need to be discovered for reaching children who attend the inner city schools." He proposed that GLCA recruit and select one thousand students over the next five years to be trained to teach in ghetto schools.

Philadelphia's public school system was at that time committing extensive resources to halt the deterioration of its schools. In GLCA, the Board of Education saw a source of enthusiastic manpower: students and faculty who wanted to work in inner city schools and community agencies and who were "naive people who don't know the job can't be done." In practical terms, it seemed possible that some of these idealists could be drawn into the system as permanent teachers. It likewise seemed possible that the school system could tap into available scholarly research in this way, providing a fit between theory and the practical problems public schools faced.

From GLCA's side, perhaps the reason the consortium rose to the challenge was, as Henry Acres suggested, the colleges' religious origins. A commitment to the welfare of humanity and a desire to use their talents on behalf of the larger society were impulses that found few outlets on GLCA's campuses (although some, particularly Antioch, did pass through the same revolutionary turbulence that was then rocking the cities). GLCA found in Philadelphia a ready-made urban laboratory where faculty and students could try out their ideas. In the integrated Germantown area of the city, where the program originally located, they came into contact with people they would never have met on a college campus, and who were eager [illegible] work toward social change. There was latitude for experimentation, space to design and implement theory, scope to develop an effective curriculum, and plenty of work for everyone. At the very least, in their encounters with community and schools, GLCA students would be able to pick up some "urban smarts."

At a practical level, the major challenge as DeHaan saw it was to stem the tide of urban deterioration and stimulate urban regeneration. In the minds of some, this orientation conflicted with a second goal, which was to integrate an urban experience into a traditional liberal arts education. This was not always performed to everyone's satisfaction: the program struggled to prove its academic worth to those who espoused a more traditional view of education and believed that social action had no place in a liberal arts curriculum. The question really came down to: What use was to be made of this social laboratory? Would it add to or detract from the education of GLCA students? Responding differently to this question, some colleges encouraged their students to enroll in the Philadelphia program, while others actively discouraged them. Two and one-half years into the program, DeHaan reported that recruiting students was still "a focus of conflict."

It is difficult to evaluate the impact these students had on Philadelphia or its school system. It is safe to assume that the individual triumphs they experienced, as well as the individual defeats, were not confined to GLCA-in-

Philadelphia but were being replicated nationwide as society struggled to right injustices done to blacks and other minorities.

In 1974, a new director was appointed to head the program, and a year later, it moved to a new location in the heart of the city. (Hope, which had assumed responsibility in 1970, continued as agent college.) Stevens Brooks, who had been involved with the program for some years, had earlier been on the faculty of Antioch-Putney Graduate School of Education and the Philadelphia Museum of Art. He brought to the program expertise in experiential education; and he perceived the program as complementary, rather than as an alternative, to the on-campus curricula.

The Philadelphia program has undergone considerable evolution during its fifteen years, but its major components remain in place. Emphasis is still on experiential learning, that is to say, learning how to learn in all areas of life, not just the classroom. The central feature of the program is a four-day-a week work placement under which students are placed in public schools and churches, a career development center, the office of the district attorney, a school for the blind, the department of public health, a psychiatric institute, the offices of city council representatives, and associations of consumers, students, and women. Reflecting the initial commitment to upgrading the schools, teacher placements preponderated in the early years but dwindled as fewer students opted for teaching as a career. Placements in business, labor unions, the arts, agencies for planning and research, social work, and community action have taken its place, paralleling national trends among career-minded college students. Over the years, enrollment has fluctuated between 121 and 181, with non-GLCA students supplying from 20 to 40 of that number in any given year.

Laura Flack, an Albion sudent in the Philadelphia Urban Semester, fulfilled her internship at Pennsylvania Hospital.

A required City Seminar (Aesthetics of the City, The Emerging Metropolis, Systems Thinking, The Urban World), supports the student in his work placement by providing a theoretical framework for explaining individual and group behavior in the city. The program has become a liberal arts urban field study program, with emphasis on liberal arts, not urban studies. However, the city continues to play the lead role of educator, and students are expected to use Philadelphia as raw material for research, as a living environment, and as a workplace. The expectation is that this process will force them to confront and reevaluate the attitudes and values they bring with them to Philadelphia.

While some of the colleges continue to restrict enrollment for financial reasons, the Urban Semester has evolved as a respected and well-utilized program within GLCA, supplying an educational component which member colleges might otherwise lack. As times have changed, emphasis has shifted away from social activism to the development of students' own knowledge, understanding, skills, attitudes and values about systems of human interaction in an urban context. This knowledge may later be applied to citizen involvement, a career, or graduate school. There is increased recognition of the career component in a student's decision to enroll in the Philadelphia program, though often career choice is itself a compound of altruism with the need to equip oneself to earn a living. The continued vitality of the program attests to the needs that it fills.

New York Arts Program

The idea of a GLCA off-campus center for the arts was first proposed in May, 1966, to Conrad Hilberry (English, Kalamazoo), then Coordinator of the GLCA Humanities Programs, who agreed to study how the concept might be implemented. As the GLCA faculty council also supported the idea of such a center, a number of exploratory meetings were held, the most important in March 1967, at Ohio Wesleyan, where all twelve member colleges were represented. It was agreed at that time that the center should be in New York City and that it should include an academic component, but it was Henry Acre's inspired suggestion to create apprenticeships.

A four-person committee—Richard Wengenroth (Art, Ohio Wesleyan), Garret Boone (Art, Earlham), Bill Craig (Theatre, Wooster), and Bob Cecil (Music, Hope)—investigated the feasibility of a New York arts center, and, convinced that student placements were indeed feasible, recommended establishing the program. Endorsement by the GLCA Humanities Committee and Faculty Council followed. Wengenroth presented the committee's report at the April 1968 meeting of the GLCA Board of Directors and recommended that steps be taken to begin the program the following February. The Board agreed, and subsequently asked Wengenroth to serve as the program's first resident director.

Together with the Philadelphia Urban Semester, the program marked a change in direction for GLCA. These were domestic rather than international programs. Both were born of a desire to break down the barrier between the academic and the "real" world through apprenticing students to adults who were actually practicing a trade—in the case of Philadelphia, educators; in that of New York, artists.

The Wengenroths moved to New York City, where their apartment on 76th Street became the program's first office. The initial group of students, arriving in February 1969, pitched in to scrub, paint, and scrounge second-hand furniture for the loft that was rented on the edge of Soho. By the following year, radio and television placements had been added to those in visual arts, and the program was on its way. Housing depended on the initiative of individual students, and they lived everywhere from Soho to Flatbush. (In later years, most students were housed together in a residential hotel.) The first descriptive brochure quoted a tuition of $960 per semester, about one-third of what it would be by 1980-81.

As it evolved, the program has three main components: apprenticeship, seminar, and journal. Students are expected to complete all three to receive full credit, which the colleges distribute in different ways depending upon their own course requirements.

The apprenticeships at the core of the program offer the student an intimate and realistic view of professional life in a broad range of the arts. Corporate sponsors in the performing arts run the gamut from the Metropolitan Opera Studio to The Muppets, from Actors Studio to the New York Shakespeare Festival. Individual producers, directors, makeup artists and lighting designers have also accepted GLCA apprentices. Dancers are apprenticed to choreographers and dance studios; music majors work with applied musicians as well as with recording studios, museums, makers of musical toys, concert halls, and critics. For the visual arts, sponsors include galleries, museums, studios, plus individual painters, jewelry makers, sculptors, photographers, and architects. Publishers and publications have accepted GLCA apprentice writers, as have film makers, and several New York radio and TV stations regularly sponsor GLCA students. The quality and "fit" of the apprenticeship determine the value of the experience for each student, and matching an apprentice to a sponsor is the most sensitive part of the director's job. A poorly placed student runs the risk of ending up as a go-fer; a well-placed one has the chance to explore her medium fully, to gain entry into the creative world, and to weigh her own career prospects in that world.

David Doyle of Ohio Wesleyan at work during his apprenticeship with artist Ben Schonzeit, in the New York Arts Program.

The program is decidedly experiential; as a means of maintaining quality control, the student is expected to record in a journal all personal experiences, observations, and discoveries of professional significance. As in Philadelphia, the seminar, conducted by staff and visiting artists, is the most criticized portion of the program. Students seem to have trouble, in the words of one evaluator, changing from "novitiate professionals by day to undergraduate students by night." Its retention, however, has always been deemed important to retaining the academic element.

The first evaluating team, led by President Thaddeus Seymour of Wabash and including both faculty and administrators, surveyed the program in 1970-71.

Its report noted that "For many colleges, an element of experiential learning has become an acknowledged, desired, and sometimes required, element in liberal education. As a type of experiential learning, the New York Arts program is superb." The team went on to recommend that the program be established on a permanent basis, keeping in mind that it was not, and was not conceived to be, a substitute for rigorous academic work on the home campuses.

Ohio Wesleyan was now appointed agent college, assuming responsibility for budget and the employment of the resident director, who continued to hire and supervise the New York staff of four or five professional artists and administrators. They locate sponsors, arrange apprenticeships, counsel students, disseminate information about the program to the campuses, and generally implement it.

In 1973, Dick Wengenroth resigned as director, to be replaced by Bertram Katz of the arts faculty of Ohio State University. Lou Wengenroth, who had been involved in the program since its inception, accepted a position as program coordinator, and when Katz resigned, became the program's director. Alvin Sher, a sculptor who had taught art at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, assumed direction of the program in 1981. At the agent college, Justin Kronewetter was the first agency director, followed by Llewellyn "Bo" Rabby. In recent years, this responsibility was assumed by Lauren Wilson, Dean of Academic Affairs.

At the outset, it was anticipated that 50 to 60 students per year would take part in the program, but that number has increased to 70 to 80, with Oberlin providing as many as 20 percent. Following altered interests of students, apprenticeships have shifted somewhat: initially, the program emphasized the visual arts, but theater, writing, photography, and radio/television have grown in popularity. Increasing professionalism among students is reflected in their requests for placements, with a larger proportion of students coming to New York with specific career goals.

In 1981, after four years of effort, Marty Kalb (Art, Ohio Wesleyan) was able to mount and send on tour an art exhibit comprised of the work of New York artists who sponsor GLCA students. The circulation of exhibits (as well as consortial booking of guest artists) had been one of the early articulated goals of GLCA, but it had taken twenty years to bring this one to fruition!

Oak Ridge Science Semester

A science semester at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) was launched with the joint sponsorship of the Division of Nuclear Energy and Training, Atomic Energy Commission in September, 1970. The Oak Ridge Science Semester (ORSS) expands the scientific dimensions of GLCA liberal arts curricula by providing faculty with access to sophisticated research facilities and by introducing students to applied research in a highly professional scientific environment.

ORNL's motivation in contracting with GLCA was to fulfill its mandate to ensure an adequate supply of manpower suited to the accomplishment of energy research and development. To achieve this goal, the laboratory engages in collaborative research and training, making its facilities available to academic institutions such as the GLCA colleges. When the Atomic Energy Commission was abolished in 1974, this function was transferred to the Energy Research and Development Administration and then to the Secretary of Energy. Throughout these changes, GLCA's contract continued to be negotiated with Union Carbide Corporation which manages the laboratory and each year subvents the consortium's program to cover faculty salaries.

The idea for a science semester at Oak Ridge originated with Charles Ricker (Physics, Albion), and Gail Norris (Biology, Denison), and was negotiated by Charles Glassick (Science Coordinator, GLCA). The program accommodates majors in mathematics, the natural and physical sciences, engineering, computer science, and (since 1976) the social sciences. Students. selected by a committee consisting of GLCA faculty, the director of the Oak Ridge Science Semester, a representative of the ORNL, and the GLCA Vice President work directly with Oak Ridge scientists in pure or applied research, assuming responsibility for some aspect of their supervisor's project. In addition to the research, seen as the most important aspect of the program, students enroll in advanced courses and interdisciplinary seminars. Courses include such subject matter as chemistry of the earth and oceans, nuclear physics, and molecular biology; tutorials are arranged individually for students with special needs not met by these courses.

A ten-year student participant survey conducted in 1979 showed a high level of satisfaction with the program, the respondents stating in a majority of cases that the Oak Ridge experience had confirmed them in their choice of a career in the sciences. In fact, 90% of respondents were pursuing graduate work, almost all of them in the sciences. The usual problems also surfaced in this survey: in matching students to advisors, in assigning students to research groups, in grouping students for seminars, and inevitably, in finding appropriate housing. But overall, the program makes it possible for a select group of students to immerse themselves in research and development in an environment that far surpasses that typically available at liberal arts colleges.

Faculty selected for the program (two to four a year) are able to work full time at the laboratory over the summer. During the fall semester, they divide their time between research and teaching and often spend the spring semester at ORNL on sabbatical leaves as well. In this way, they are able to keep abreast of scientific developments and continue with their own research, overcoming the limitations of less sophisticated laboratories on their own campuses. Through them, knowledge and enthusiasm are transmitted from a major center of scientific research directly to undergraduates.

The first group of faculty arrived at Oak Ridge in June of 1970; Gail Norris (Biology, Denison) served as the program's first director, with a resident staff consisting of Martin Ludington (Physics, Albion) and John Kuempel (Chemistry, DePauw).

Albion became the first agent college for the program, starting in 1971. With Bud Ricker's departure for private industry, bids were taken from the various colleges with an interest in supervising the program. The requirements for agent, as set forth by Joe Rogers, GLCA vice president, stipulated that the college have a science faculty member familiar with ORNL and willing to serve as agency director. Denison was named agent temporarily in 1975, and permanently the following year. Ron Winters (Physics) served as director until 1978, when Bill Hoffman (Chemistry) assumed that responsibility. Also in 1978, after several years of merger discussions, ACM assumed joint sponsorship of the program.

DePauw student Kevin Thomas engaged in research into enzyme activity in the Biology Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The number of institutions involved in the program (25) required a rather more complex advisory committee than is usual for GLCA programs. It is comprised of the ORSS director and social science coordinator; the vice presidents of GLCA and ACM; a representative of the National Laboratory; the resident director; a faculty representative from each of the consortia; and a social science faculty member who does not come from the consortium of the resident director. General policy is the responsibility of the ORSS director, who obtains the advice and consent of his advisory committee for changes relating to calendar, budget, staff, and student application procedures. The Provost of Denison University maintains general supervision of the program, together with the vice presidents of the two consortia.

Marine Biology

In February 1962, as one of the first actions of the newly-formed GLCA, representatives from six biology departments led by Edward Kormondy (Oberlin), sought to determine the feasibility of a consortial program in marine biology. This committee's recommendation was that GLCA seek out an affiliation with an established marine station having a strong instructional and research program and an attitude compatible with that of liberal arts colleges. An established station, it was felt, would provide the physical facilities necessary to execute a cooperative program in marine biology, as well as the personnel to assure a successful intellectual experience for both students and faculty.

Six years were to pass before a program got underway, the major difficulty lying in reaching agreement with an established program. At first, an alliance with Duke University was thought to be feasible, but this failed to materialize because of increased space demands by that University. A proposed affiliation with Florida State University also fell through when the National Science Foundation grant necessary to finance the program was rejected. (The need for GLCA students to pay out-of-state tuition at these universities raised the cost of the program substantially.) Finally, an NSF grant for a joint proposal by GLCA and the University of California at Santa Barbara enabled the program to get underway in the summer of 1968 with courses designed by GLCA and facilities provided by the Marine Science Institute of UCSB, which also acted as fiscal agent. William Gilbert (Biology, Albion) served as program director.

The program was designed to be mutually supportive of the partners' interests. GLCA wished to provide students with a marine biology experience and faculty with the opportunity for research in this area. The University of California hoped to attract graduate students to its Santa Barbara campus. Instruction consisted of a six-week intensive course with field trips, seminars, and lectures by visiting professors. Promising students were selected to carry on independent research for an additional three weeks. Also, three GLCA faculty members were able to conduct research over the summer, becoming a resource pool for the teaching of marine biology within the consortium.

Although student and faculty participants were generally enthusiastic about the program, it was discontinued after three years since numerous programs at established marine stations offered opportunities for students to gain experience without the intervention of the consortium.

Wilderness Program

The concept of wilderness education as a builder of character prompted Landrum Bolling to experiment with it at Earlham as a way to encourage bonding among freshman students. When GLCA's request for support for a similar program was granted by both the Reader's Digest Foundation and The Lilly Endowment, a consortial wilderness program was launched in 1973.

The stated goals of the program were to investigate the various wilderness opportunities available; to define and explore long-term goals of such programs and their relationship to traditional education; to train GLCA personnel in wilderness survival techniques; and to foster the development of wilderness programs at GLCA colleges.

Under terms of the grants, three levels of activity took place. The first was devoted to developing knowledge and enthusiasm for wilderness activities throughout the GLCA community. The second focused on training individuals to serve as leaders of college wilderness adventures. The third offered support for individual college programs through a series of mini-grants and visiting consultants.

The first phase was activated in September 1973 at YMCA Camp Clements near Richmond, Indiana, where sixteen consultants from Outward Bound and the National Outdoor Leadership School worked with seventy GLCA faculty, students, and administrators. The experience of outdoor living aroused enthusiasm for a consortial effort at wilderness education. On another occasion, four of the college presidents and their wives—the Fullers of Oberlin, Rainsfords of Kalamazoo, Van Wylens of Hope, and Tom Wenzlau of Ohio Wesleyan, plus Trevor Gamble (Physics, Denison) and James Gammon (Zoology, DePauw)—canoed down the Green River of Colorado. Persuaded that the experience had value, George Rainsford took the lead in pressing for more such programs.

Subsequently, several training sessions to prepare leaders for college wilderness programs were organized, one in June 1974 and the other in the winter of 1975-76. In the course of these sessions, the difference between enthusiasm for wilderness programs and the in-depth skills necessary to lead other novices through the experience safely soon became apparent. Leadership is more easily developed for relatively low risk activities such as hiking and camp craft than for higher risk activities such as mountain climbing. Training had to be specific to the environment encountered: a successful course in the Rockies does not equip one for white-water canoeing. Some trainees returned from the wilderness with the negative but valuable knowledge that they were ill-suited for such ventures. Still others experienced substantial personal growth.

Because the program was valued more as an aid to group bonding than for skills-building, the decision was made not to attempt a permanent consortial program. Instead, each college was encouraged to apply to GLCA for a mini-grant to institute the type of program best suited to its needs. In this way, Albion received assistance for a new biology/geology program in Wyoming; Antioch sent expenditions to Pennsylvania and West Virginia. Denison bought equipment for a program conducted first in West Virginia and later in Texas; DePauw received assistance for a canoeing venture in northern Minnesota; while Earlham covered some costs of a new winter term course in the desert Southwest. Hope used its grant to support a course utilizing wild areas in Western Michigan, and Kalamazoo took college leaders on a Green River expedition. Kenyon sponsored a training expedition to the Wyoming Rockies, while Oberlin organized a canoe trip emphasizing the biology and geology of Western Ontario. Ohio Wesleyan purchased equipment for short-term expeditions within driving distance of its campus and The College of Wooster initiated a pre-freshman program in the Adirondacks.

The use of mini-grants to stimulate activity by the colleges meant that expiration of the grant in spring of 1975 did not terminate wilderness education. Leaders had been trained and equipment bought; an enhanced understanding of wilderness education remained, and colleges that wished to continue offering wilderness opportunities to their students were able to do so. More difficult to measure was the success of the program in encouraging students to make sound, ethical decisions related to group governance and interpersonal relations. In this sector, results no doubt differed from group to group, and in any case were never satisfactorily analyzed.

In a related development, Laurence Barrett worked, during his year as acting GLCA president, with a group of faculty to explore possible cooperation on freshwater research. George Rainsford obtained a $4000 grant from the Dow Foundation to provide support for this activity. With these funds, a GLCA conference on "Uses of the Outdoor Environment for Teaching and Research," at Hope in October 1975, brought together forty-six participants from eighteen colleges. In combination with a survey of freshwater teaching resources available at the GLCA colleges, the conference gave the topic visibility and established links between faculty members who shared this interest.

Newberry Library

GLCA affiliation with the ACM Newberry Library Program in the Humanities was proposed in March 1975, the tenth year in which this program operated. The Library, located in Chicago, houses approximately one million books and five million manuscripts. Its special-interest collections range from Portuguese history and literature to archives of the American West.

As the disciplines of history, philosophy and literature are not specifically covered by any other GLCA program, the Newberry term provides students a unique opportunity for an intensive academic experience in these areas as well as in political science. It also offers faculty members the use of the Newberry's excellent research facilities. Two faculty members from GLCA and/or ACM are appointed as Fellows: one for six months and the other for eleven months as Fellow and program director. Other faculty members teach one-month seminars.

During the fall term, students attend seminars on a central topic such as "The Dilemma of Liberalism" or "Art and Capital: The Creative Arts in the Commercial World." Under the guidance of Fellows, they pursue an interdisciplinary project related to the seminar. Short term seminars on topics such as Arthurian literature, Iberian expansion, and the Chicago Renaissance are offered in the spring.

Serious students respond well to the program. Freedom to choose their own research topics, the vast resources of the library at their disposal, and autonomous life in Chicago, combine to provide a growth experience for academically oriented students.

Some Unrealized Possibilities

Such widely divergent areas of sharing as computer use, film making, and medical education were also the object of early attempts at developing consortial programs. In each instance, the needs of the twelve campuses were first surveyed and agreement reached on the type of program desired. In each instance, however, the initiative was thwarted by real obstacles in the environment. The notion of a centralized computer system, for example, to be housed in the GLCA office with terminals at each of the colleges, seemed most attractive when first suggested. It foundered in a sea of options as technology proliferated and individual faculty members or entire departments urged their administrations to buy into the systems they judged best suited to their particular needs. Keeping abreast of film-making technology while conforming to the needs of twelve different curricula also came to be seen as both difficult and inordinately expensive. Of all these efforts, the plan that acquired the most serious backing was for the integration of parts of the medical school curriculum with the standard four year liberal arts curriculum of the GLCA colleges. Because no fewer than 150 GLCA graduates per year were accepted into US medical schools in the five-year period ending 1971, providing almost 2% of this country's first-year medical students, such integration was not unreasonable. But the plan, though it appeared both viable and attractive, proved impossible to mesh with the needs and capacities of the medical schools themselves, and had to be abandoned.

The Consortium at Ten

Thematic off-campus programs focused the consortium more directly on the domestic, rather than the international scene, and thereby expanded the range of options available to GLCA students and faculty. In terms of administrative style, not much changed. Each program was placed under the overall direction of an agent college, whose responsibilities were progressively defined and refined. Advisory committees drawn from faculty of the other colleges advised and supported program directors at each agent college. Administration at the program sites was infinitely eased by their location in American cities, where resident directors "spoke the lingo." Competent program leadership—in some cases, inspired—kept administrative weight off the central office, and Acres, like Johnson before him, operated much of the time without a vice president.

Inevitably, the administrative load did increase as the number of programs multiplied and as GLCA tentatively began its involvement with national politics. Acres acquired assistance when the Board authorized appointment of a Science Coordinator, to be housed in the central office. Charles Glassick, who had taught chemistry at Adrian College and later was an ACE Fellow with Frederick Ness (then President of Fresno State College, later President of AAC), worked for GLCA just one year, 1968-69, during which time he negotiated the Oak Ridge Science Semester. When Glassick went on to the deanship at Albion, he was not directly replaced. Paul Bradley, a graduate student at the University of Michigan, acted as assistant to Acres while writing his doctoral dissertation on academic consortium effectiveness. In 1969-70, GLCA budgeted a central office secretarial line of $12,600, while ACM budgeted $53,000.

When he was authorized to hire a vice president, Acres brought to Ann Arbor William Petrek of the DePauw faculty, who had been active on the International Education Committee. Almost a year after Petrek's departure, his place was taken by Joe Rogers, a chemistry professor from Earlham. Rogers was to become involved in the Wilderness Program and in the effort to dovetail GLCA curricula with the first year of medical school education.

In intervals between vice presidents, Acres ran GLCA with the help of a secretary and Eve Mouilso. One of Johnson's legacies to GLCA, Mouilso has been with the consortium since 1964. A graduate of Schoolcraft College and a Certified Professional Secretary, Mouilso was elected Secretary of the year by the Michigan Division of National Secretaries Association in 1968-69. As administrative officer of GLCA, she takes charge of the consortium's finances and also arranges travel and conference logistics. Although Acres withstood the strain of breaking in three vice presidents, he was unable to sustain the loss of Mouilso when she took the 1969-70 academic year off. Acres won her back, and she continues at the core of the GLCA operation.

By 1970, in Acres' estimation, GLCA had spent the momentum of its early years. The international and domestic study programs were to a large extent meeting their goals, and were functioning semi-autonomously. Growth, having taken place without planning, now required consolidation. New questions were beginning to ferment to which no clear answers could be discerned. These concerned relationships within the consortium, and between the consortium and its peers in higher education.

Two internal questions were: what was the appropriate role of faculty in consortial governance? and what was the appropriate balance between the colleges and the central office? Externally, the questions were: should GLCA remain a Club of Twelve, or merge with another group, possibly ACM? and should GLCA take a more active role in representing its interests before the federal government?

These questions are raised here because they were coming to the fore during Acres' presidency. Before examining them, however, it will be useful to complete the review of consortial programs by looking at those relating to faculty development.

CHAPTER IV

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

An astonishing range of programs has been sponsored by GLCA under the rubric of faculty development. Over the years, dozens of successful initiatives have emerged to meet specific developmental needs, and their cumulative impact changed the understanding of what GLCA was all about.

As America entered the seventies, college faculties all over the country were concerned with ways to improve instruction and adapt teaching strategies to the rapid social changes of the preceding decade. By this date, financial and population projections were beginning to point to faculties stable in size and far less mobile than they had been in the past. Decreased faculty mobility meant increased need to enhance the skills and enthusiasm of teachers who would most likely remain at the same institution throughout their professional careers. Furthermore, as inflation took hold, it became apparent that institutions with high tuitions would be priced out of the market unless they clearly and unequivocally retained their academic leadership. "As the competition gets tougher, we are going to have to get better," as one faculty member put it. In a rapidly changing society, the college that stood still would stagnate; to stagnate in an inflationary market was to be doomed.

In August 1973, Acres resigned from the GLCA presidency to take up the position of Chancellor of Cedar Crest and Muhlenberg Colleges. At this point, as at the time of Johnson's departure, there was indecision over the direction that GLCA ought to be taking, and thus hesitance over choosing a new president. In the one-year hiatus that ensued, the Board selected Laurence Barrett, Dean of Kalamazoo College, to serve as acting president. Barrett, a graduate of Amherst and Princeton, had spent World War II as a commander of sub-chasers and escort ships. He brought a new dynamism to the association by activating a whole generation of faculty members who had not previously been involved with GLCA.

The preponderance of consortial efforts until this time had been directed toward the development of off-campus programs for students. But the consortium had not been insensitive to faculty needs: in fact, the very first project authorized by the Board was an attempt to support innovation in teaching. This interest was confirmed with the award of a Carnegie grant in the Humanities in 1966, and gathered momentum over the next few years as more and more faculty members became involved in the attempt to define and actualize faculty development.

Consortial engagement with faculty development became the principal item of internal business during Barrett's caretaker presidency. It was built into the GLCA structure during the succeeding presidency of Jon Fuller, becoming —along with its spin-off, women's studies—the next major thrust of the consortium. GLCA was developing a broader reach and increasing its sophistication in meeting the developmental needs of faculty members.

Programmed Instruction Project

The Programmed Instruction Project[1] was the first association-wide project authorized by the Board. As emphasis at GLCA colleges had always been on excellence in teaching, some skepticism was expressed over initiation of so frankly empirical a project. It was questioned whether programs could teach at all; if they could, whether this method was suitable to these colleges; if they were, might they render instructors obsolete?

Himself persuaded of the value of programming, Robert DeHaan (Psychology, Hope) submitted a proposal to the US Office of Education which was funded under the title "Dissemination Activities Concerned with the More Effective Utilization of Media for Educational Purposes." The original contract and its extension ran from June 1963 to June 1966, and the project was directed throughout by DeHaan.

The purposes of the project were to develop programmed instructional materials for college level teaching, to evaluate existing commercial programmed materials, to compare uses of programmed materials in order to discover where they fit into the curriculum, to promote basic research in programming and evaluate its effect, and to disseminate results of the project.

Despite the skepticism with which the project was met, all twelve colleges participated; over three years an estimated 200 faculty members (about 15% of total faculty) became directly involved in the project. Forty-two faculty members were trained in the principles and procedures of programming, and went on to prepare actual course materials. Five of these received further intensive training and became consultants or editors for other programmers. More than two dozen faculty members participated in evaluating these materials for their impact on students and on instructors.

Evaluation showed that programs taught as well as or better than other methods of instruction, though different programs succeeded for different reasons and to varying degrees with different sectors of the student population. By using PI selectively, instructors could gain time for exploring the humanistic aspects of their subject with their students. Some instructors reoriented their teaching methods as a result of their experience with PI; however, there is no evidence that curricula were substantially altered. The subsequent introduction of computer-assisted language instruction may owe something to this program.

---

[1] A program consists of a set of items selected and ordered in such a way that a student, working through the set, can gain optimal mastery of the materials and skills. A program is relatively self-instructional; it constantly calls upon the student to respond. Programmed instruction has more to do with the method than with the content of teaching.

Teaching Internships

The concept of teaching internships at the postdoctoral level was developed by the chemistry department at Antioch College in 1963 when it appeared that a crisis in recruitment of chemistry professors would occur within the decade. It was predicated on what its author, Richard Yalman, called "a rather naive hypothesis: that if a young Ph.D. had the opportunity to spend a year on a college campus observing and participating in the activities of college life at the staff level, he might elect to make college teaching his career."

With financial support from the Charles F. Kettering Foundation, GLCA offered 36 postdoctoral internships in chemistry and biology over the next three years. In accepting the interns, the primary objective of the twelve colleges was to offer incentives to young scientists to consider teaching as a main focus of their careers. Also, the colleges were interested in bringing to their campuses young people who were at the frontiers of their specialties. At the same time, through a network of mentors working with the interns, assistance was provided for the development of pedagogical techniques—an aspect of training overlooked by professional graduate schools.

The interns divided their time among teaching, directing undergraduate research, and pursuing their own research interests. They received modest stipends, and at the end of the year were aided in entering the job market by a brochure, produced and distributed by GLCA, which advertised their skills. As a result of the Kettering approach, 30 of the interns elected to go into teaching—22 of these at the undergraduate level.

Humanities Program

From 1966 through 1969, a Carnegie grant in the amount of $180,000 enabled GLCA to conduct a Humanities Program designed to stimulate creativity in the arts and humanities among faculty and students. The program had a dual thrust. Awards to individual faculty members and students encouraged scholarly and creative work; and three major conferences brought GLCA into contact with humanists who were contributing vigorously to American intellectual life.

Individual projects involved new approaches to teaching or were distinguished by some speculative or interdisciplinary dimension. For example, with a $450 grant from GLCA and $50 contributed by his own college, Donald E. Boyd of Kenyon set up a print shop and developed a course on the art of the book in which he taught printing and graphics to his students. The Zeitgeist coffee house on the Wooster campus bought sound and lighting equipment that enabled it to promote more ambitious theatrical productions. GLCA funds allowed Royce Dendler of Oberlin to construct "The Aesthetic Ride," a sculptured chair that moves on a lighted track. (A successor to that project was acquired by the Chicago Museum of Contemporary Art.) The Computer Bible: A Critical Concordance to the Synoptic Gospels, a pioneering publication by J. Arthur Baird of Wooster, was made possible by grants of $840 and $360. It is apparent that a great deal of creativity was supported by extremely small amounts of money.

Over the three-year period, the Humanities Program made a total of 120 such awards. In an attempt to build support for special projects into their budgets, the colleges contributed graduated amounts—10% the first year, 20% the second, and 30% the third. The awards were made by a selection committee composed of Paul Arnold (Art, Oberlin); Alburey Castell (Philosophy, Wooster); Owen Duston (English, Wabash—third round only); Shaw Livermore, Jr. (History, University of Michigan); Anthony Taffs (Music, Albion); and Conrad Hilberry (English, Kalamazoo), Coordinator of the Humanities Program..

Under Hilberry's low-key but inspirational guidance, the Humanities Program also pursued its second objective of placing faculty and students in contact with innovative scholars in the humanities. In November of 1966, about 70 faculty and students met at the Johnson Foundation Conference Center (Wingspread) at Racine, Wisconsin, to discuss the directions that scholarship and research might most fruitfully take. Out of these exchanges came ideas for an assortment of GLCA programs which no one could have predicted, including the New York Arts Program, the New Writer's Award, a GLCA film center, and a collaborative program linking GLCA with various midwestern universities.

A second Wingspread Conference the following year brought together faculty and students from the six universities (Case-Western Reserve, Cincinnati, Indiana, Michigan, Michigan State, and Ohio State) which had been identified as potential partners of GLCA, as well as faculty and students from the GLCA colleges themselves, to discuss "Problems of Cultural Identity." Focusing on such themes as "The New Negro Mood," the conference stimulated a chain of events that led to the initiation of courses in Black Studies at several of the GLCA colleges. A third conference was held at Wooster in 1968 and examined "Psychology and the Humanities."

Some spin-offs of these conferences, such as the New York Arts Program and the New Writer's Award, became permanent functions of the consortium. A major disappointment was the inability to launch a GLCA program in film. Professional filmmaker Richard Kaplan, who had participated in the first of the Carnegie conferences, was commissioned to survey film resources on the twelve campuses; this he did in academic year 1967-68. Although the need and the interest were established, GLCA was unable to obtain funding to move ahead in this area, and the project was eventually dropped.

The project for GLCA-University Cooperation was a child of its times. It had two principal parts: one was a program of bringing advanced graduate students from the six universities to GLCA colleges as teaching associates. Reciprocally, GLCA faculty members were to spend a year or a semester within university departments, teaching and engaging in research. This dual program came to be supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities and was led by Charles B. Teske of Oberlin. Through competitive application, 22 teaching associates from the participating universities were brought to GLCA campuses over the period of two years; however, only one faculty member was able to work out a visiting scholar-teacher arrangement.

Staff of the Kenyon School of English, 1950. From left: Philip B. Rice, William Empson, Arthur Mizener, Robert T.S. Lowell, John Crowe Ranson, Kenneth Burke, L.C. Knight, Delmore Schartz, and Charles M. Coffin. GLCA's sponsorship of the New Writers' Award continues a tradition of engagement with American literary criticism.

New Writers' Award

In November of 1967, Harold Harris (English, Kalamazoo) wrote to chairs of English departments at the other eleven colleges outlining a plan to recognize new American writers. At a meeting the following spring, other GLCA English department chairs endorsed it. As a consequence, Harris arranged a meeting of interested publishers at the offices of McGraw-Hill Book Company, which was attended by representatives of the Viking Press, Random House, Meredith Press, The Macmillan Co., Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, and David McKay Company. Attending for GLCA, in addition to Harris, were Howard Roerecke, also of Kalamazoo, and David Britt of Wabash. At this meeting, the principles of the program were agreed upon: to recognize and encourage the best first published works of fiction and poetry each year, and to bring the winning authors and poets to GLCA campuses.

From a rather modest beginning, involving fewer than two dozen entries each year, the program has grown so that now more than 100 publishers are included in the annual notification. In 1981, 27 volumes of fiction and 39 of poetry were entered.

Winners of the New Writers' Award tour GLCA colleges reading their work, leading seminars, and meeting with faculty members and students. Initially, publishers paid the cost of these tours, but when it appeared that small presses and university publishers were in danger of being squeezed out of the competition, the colleges began covering expenses. A small grant from the Detroit Bank and Trust Company helped out, and in 1981, the Witter Bynner Foundation for Poetry agreed to subvent the poetry competition.

The awards program is presently directed by Donald Baker, poet-in-residence at Wabash College. Selections are made by a panel of judges drawn from the literature faculties of GLCA colleges. Judges receive a modest honorarium plus the opportunity to apply their critical skills in an increasingly prestigious awards competition.

A GLCA Spring Poetry Festival, started by James Cook at Albion in 1980 is on its way to becoming an annual event, featuring appearances by new poets who have been recognized by the award.

In the long run, the most significant outcome of the Carnegie Humanities Program may have been the formation within GLCA of a coterie who were convinced that the consortium should offer ongoing assistance to faculty in reconsidering the kinds of teaching they were doing. The consortium was becoming the vehicle for bringing together previously isolated faculty members. Once familiarity and trust developed among them, ideas were generated and personnel identified to see projects through. Groups of professionals started to convene on an ad hoc basis, and it was becoming clear that the consortium was an appropriate vehicle for faculty development—if agreement could be reached on what that meant.

Faculty Development: Finding Ways and Means

Proposals for the renovation of teaching styles welled up from within the GLCA Humanities Council even as the Carnegie funds ran out; deliberations then were transferred to a Committee on Teaching and Learning, established by Academic Council. One proposal seriously considered was that by James Cook for establishing a thirteenth college: a Center for the Continuing Education of Faculties which would be independent, credit-granting and innovative.

Also proposed within the Committee was a sort of division of labor among the colleges, with each made agent for particular aspects of the curriculum—natural sciences, for example. A functional distribution was also suggested, with one college assuming responsibility for developing self-paced instruction, another, data retrieval systems. Teacher training for faculty was suggested, as well as the initiation of a system under which professors would exchange courses and living quarters on one another's campuses.

All of these ideas foundered on one of two obstacles: either the dispersion which reduces the feasibility of cross-registration by students from all but the three closely grouped Ohio colleges (Denison, Kenyon, and Ohio Wesleyan); or else on the traditional pattern of liberal arts education to which the colleges were wedded. Despite the ferment, very little in fact was being accomplished. In the words of Ohio Wesleyan President Tom Wenzlau, "GLCA had plateaued."

Considerable leverage was exerted on this situation by Larry Barrett, who perceived stagnation occurring at two levels: institutionally, some colleges had drifted away from involvement with the consortium, leaving just a few colleges active at its core; at the individual level, GLCA was still in the hands of the same men who had started the consortium, and some of them were not as energetic in problem-solving as once they had been. International education, formerly the great energizer, had lost much of its attraction. Paradoxically, the most committed supporters of GLCA still were those faculty involved in the overseas programs. Barrett felt the consortium had to be reinvigorated by engaging the allegiance of junior faculty. How could this be done?

Convinced that faculty development was the key, the acting president set about crystalizing the issues which had been raised and activating younger faculty to deal with them. With the backing of the Board, he visited each campus in order to identify "the promising, the gifted, the dissatisfied, the impatient," as he put it, ultimately inviting one person from each campus to join a new Professional Activities Committee (PAC).[2] This took up with determination where the old committee had left off. Barrett charged the PAC "to plan, in detail, ways in which we can improve the way we meet our professional obligations to students." Stephen Scholl (History, Ohio Wesleyan), whom he asked to chair the committee, in turn asked the members to provide specific agenda items to the Academic and Deans' Councils within three months. Of the issues PAC took up—counseling, compensatory education, faculty evaluation, and instructional design—attention came to focus more and more on the last, largely because of the energy and imagination with which Frederick and Havholm tackled this subject.

In February 1974, Barrett was advised by the Lilly Endowment of an allocation of funds for the support of new and promising projects in the area of faculty development. GLCA was invited to submit a proposal for funding.

While a preliminary approach was made to Lilly by Barrett and Dean Joe Elmore of Earlham, proposals continued to be brainstormed by the PAC. One of these provided for a consortial advisory panel on promotions, contracts, and tenure, which marked the outer limits of authority which anyone was willing to cede to GLCA. Barrett then deployed some PAC members to talk to officers of the Lilly Endowment, and the proposal issuing from this meeting succeeded in attracting support.

Funded in the amount of $404,000, the Lilly grant was matched by $207,750 from the twelve colleges. The money was extended on a sliding scale: Lilly began by paying two-thirds of the expenses of the program, with the participating colleges contributing the remaining third; by the final year of the grant, the ratio was reversed. The institutions were able thereafter to assume responsibility for the cost of an ongoing faculty development program. Running throughout the years 1975-77, the Lilly grant made it possible to develop a comprehensive response to the nexus of problems that had been identified. Experimentation was the watchword; the grant provided leeway for experimentation without drawing down excessively the funds the colleges needed to continue operations at the old level.

---

2. In 1974, the Professional Activities Committee consisted of James Cook (Albion), Carl Clark (Antioch), Larry Ledebur (Denison), James Cooper (DePauw), Gordon Thompson (Earlham), Herbert Dershem (Hope), Marcelle Dale (Kalamazoo), Richard Hoppe (Kenyon), Norman Grant (Oberlin), Stephen Scholl (Ohio Wesleyan), Peter Frederick (Wabash), Peter Havholm (Wooster).

Activity under the Lilly grant began as Jon Fuller assumed the GLCA presidency. Educated at Pomona, Oxford and Princeton, Fuller had taught political science at Princeton and at Davidson College before becoming Special Assistant to the United States Commissioner of Education and later to the Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health Education and Welfare. A Phi Beta Kappa who won Woodrow Wilson, Danforth, and Marshall scholarships all in one year, Fuller brought formidable intellectual and political skills to the GLCA presidency. Aware of the need continually to exploit new initiatives in order to retain consortial vitality, Fuller threw his efforts behind faculty development. As he put it several years later:

> . . . loyalty to (a consortium) is based on expectations of future benefits, rather than on any sense of commitment or appreciation for past services. . . . To maintain loyalty for an association of colleges, it is necessary to have a series of continuing new initiatives. Simply maintaining old programs, whatever their continuing merits, will not be enough.

Fuller assembled a strong advisory committee consisting of Scholl, Paul Lacey (English, Earlham), Garber Drushal (President, Wooster), Louis Brakeman (Provost, Denison), Peter Frederick (History, Wabash), Larry Barrett, and himself. Later, James Cooper (History, DePauw), Frances Lucas (Psychology, Albion), and Robert Longsworth (Dean, Oberlin) were added. Representation thus included faculty, chief academic officers, presidents, and the GLCA office. This group oversaw faculty development activities and planned for continuation of similar activities after expiration of the grant. The program was directed by Scholl, who was released part-time from his teaching responsibilities for this purpose. But though Scholl remained in Delaware, Ohio Wesleyan was not made agent college for the program. Rather, Fuller kept the consortium as a whole directly involved in its operation and after July 1977 (when Scholl was preparing to move up to a deanship), transferred it to the GLCA office, where it became a prime responsibility of the vice president. This move signalled that faculty development was to have a permanent place on the GLCA agenda.

Faculty Development Begins

At its inception, the GLCA Faculty Development Program devoted its major resources to a fellowship program. Thirty-four faculty members in 1975-76 and another 40 the following year received fellowships that enabled them to design projects intended to enhance student learning and instructor satisfaction. Fellowships were awarded for such projects as development of self-paced instructional materials in theoretical mechanics, experimentation in inductive approaches to discussion, and improvement of interdisciplinary team-teaching. Fellows participated in weekend conferences and a month-long summer workshop on personal, instructional, and institutional development, the purpose of which was to reinforce the notion that projects were meant to ferment continously, ultimately bringing about changes in the faculty member's teaching behavior.

Quite a few Fellows were able to extend the benefit of their term of study to their home institutions. David Hershiser brought his video group feedback project back to Oberlin, where faculty used it to observe and critique their own teaching styles. Peter Havholm developed a handbook for freshman colloquia at Wooster. Nancy Nowik's work on the reticent student led to a campus workshop at Denison and an effective session at summer workshops in following years. This month-long workshop was expected to become the primary vehicle for generating ways of improving teaching behavior. Here, GLCA was advancing into unknown territory and, not surprisingly, made a false start.

The first session of the workshop, at Meadowbrook Hall on the Oakland University campus, lasted ten days and focused on improvement of classroom instructional skills and technology as well as on personal development via sensitivity training. The second portion, held at Saint Mary's College in Winona, Minnesota, emphasized the institutional context, the meshing of personal and professional growth in the context of the family, and offered a laboratory for micro-teaching.

The gestalt institute that was tried out at this time proved a liberating experience for some, and a most irritating one for others. Some participants experienced it as a meaningful and useful event, while others complained that it interrupted work on the projects for which their fellowships had been awarded. More seriously, numbers of faculty perceived the institute as an attempt to impose a particular educational philosophy upon educators who possessed great diversity in outlook and whose views were not taken into consideration. Invasion of privacy was the obverse of "meaningful exploration of teaching style."

The controversy that engulfed the program arose from the differing expectations of faculty members who viewed teaching primarily as an intellectual venture and those who approached teaching as one aspect of a lifestyle. It was certainly a miscalculation to assume that a program which intervened in the personal lives of faculty would gain their adherence. The deans, however, remained persuaded of the value of faculty development and urged continued exploration. At a meeting of the advisory committee, Peter Frederick came up with a new model for the summer workshop that consisted of a single intensive week focused on the development of a course and addressed other professional issues only obliquely. In its revised form, the workshop continues to be offered each summer.

Conferences, Workshops, and Consultations

The GLCA summer workshop on course design and teaching is now structured so as to enable participants to think their way through the design of a new course or the redesigning of an old one. Groups of about twenty faculty participants, with the aid of six or seven staff members (themselves GLCA faculty for the most part) examine course objectives, student learning styles, classroom skills, alternative approaches to teaching, ways to involve students in instruction, evaluation of student performance, assessment of teaching, and other matters. Extensive use is made of videotaping and comments by colleagues. Attendance is voluntary; the colleges support their own participants financially, so that GLCA bears only the cost of staff time for planning and publicity.

Staff and participants at the 1982 Summer Workshop in Course Design and Teaching, which was held at Bellemont Manor, Albion College.

Weekend faculty development conferences are another important and permanent addition to the GLCA agenda to have resulted from the Lilly grant. Designed by faculty members around a common area of interest, they aim to facilitate interaction, communication, and professional growth among teachers who share a commitment to the liberal arts. The conferences are based on the premise that collegial exchange of ideas on teaching issues is important to vitality in teaching. The faculty member interested in improving his pedagogical skills can learn best by seeing himself mirrored in the behavior and methodology of his peers. For worthwhile examination, certain teaching issues require an exchange of ideas and expertise, many of which can be discussed more candidly off campus than on. All these conditions are supplied by the consortium, and in addition, the pooling of resources makes it possible for staff to take over the logistics of the conference.

Until the time of the Lilly grant, no regular means of communication between the GLCA office and faculty at the twelve colleges had existed, although there were occasional issues of a newsletter. The Faculty Development Newsletter was published during the lifetime of the grant, edited by Beth Reed, who had joined the program as administrative assistant. This publication merged with its evanescent predecessor to form the Faculty Newsletter in the fall of 1976. With the shift of responsibility for faculty development to the GLCA office, Reed and the Newsletter moved to Ann Arbor.

A confidential consultant service was another program developed by the Professional Activities Committee, with the encouragement of the deans and Academic Council. Thirty-six experienced faculty, recruited to offer this service to their colleagues, received training for this purpose in the fall of 1975, after which their services were advertised in the GLCA Newsletter. To preserve confidentiality, applications for assistance were made through the GLCA office rather than the home campus. This process separated assistance from evaluation; the object was to improve the ability of the faculty member to derive success and satisfaction from life as a teacher.

Although the idea seemed apt, the response to it was meager; 15 consultations the first year, 17 the second. Distance between client and consultant appeared to be one obstacle; the need for complete confidentiality another. In the small worlds of GLCA campuses, the consultancies had to be insulated socially as well as professionally. But this vital professional secrecy made it hard to advertise the service credibly. The consultant service maintained a nominal existence for several years but was not widely used.

At the end of the first two years of the Lilly program, the Academic and Deans' Councils met to discuss what future activities GLCA should sponsor. Their first step was to request six faculty members each to visit two campuses (not their own) in order to sound out reactions to faculty development. Meeting with GLCA Fellows, consultants, workshop participants, and others who had been involved with the various projects, the six conducted structured interviews and reported back to Deans' Council.

Though not unmixed, the report showed that there was strong interest in pursuing faculty development. Accordingly, at their meeting in November 1976, the deans voted to endorse ". . . the concept of a series of specialized workshops to meet the multiple needs of the Association. These would include: weeklong summer workshops; weekend workshops on particular topics for several neighboring colleges; and weekend personal development workshops for participants at similar stages of their careers."

Henceforth, planning and publicity were to be financed from the GLCA budget. The colleges finance participation by their own faculty members, and therefore the consortium's budget line for faculty development runs to only about $4000 per year.

By February of 1977, a new vice president, Donn Neal, was taking charge of faculty development activities. Once he hit his stride, Neal was able to offer between six and eight different workshops per academic year. Each is designed around a central teaching issue and attracts from 30 to 50 faculty members. Usually lasting two days, the typical workshop takes place during a weekend of the academic year, often on a GLCA campus but occasionally at a state- or privately-run conference center. An effort is made to rotate the conference locations so as to allow equal ease of access to all faculty members; inevitably, some colleges have better conference facilities than others, so tend to be used more frequently. An early attempt at absolute equity resulted in the scheduling of one faculty development conference in Van Wert, Ohio, the precise center of consortial territory. It is a location to which members have not returned. Most sessions are led by GLCA faculty, though an outside expert may be invited to deal with a specialized topic. The convening of faculty members who are involved in the same discipline but who would not otherwise come in contact with one another creates a congenial forum for the exchange of ideas. In fact, the collegiality that develops at these conferences, based as it is on complementary professional interests and shared personal commitment, has become the most prized outcome of the program.

As was true before the Lilly grant, faculty development activities continue to be sponsored by the individual colleges as well; the consortium supplements and opens out their schedules, but does not supplant them. The consortial dimension adds a feature which a single college alone could not provide: a network of peers with a range of interest and experience which one would not expect to find outside a large university.

Faculty Development Conferences, 1975-1982

Under the Lilly Grant

9-75	Student/Faculty Relations	Wooster
9-75	Teaching Urban Studies	Denison
10-75	Uses of the Outdoor Environment for Teaching and Research	Hope
3-76	Women's Studies	Earlham
4-76	Teaching Writing	Kalamazoo
1-77	Critical Issues in Teaching Strategies, Curricula and Personal Growth	Rochester, IN

Under GLCA sponsorship

2-77	GLCA Writing Workshop	DePauw
4-77	Foreign Languages Conference	Wooster
6-77	Workshop on Course Design and Teaching I	Kenyon
2-78	Leadership in On-Campus Faculty Development Activities	Fort Wayne
2-78	Film and Teaching	Albion
3-78	Conference of Sociologists and Anthropologists	Denison
6-78	Workshop on Course Design and Teaching II	Kenyon
10-78	Oak Ridge National Laboratory as a Resource for Social Scientists	Ohio Wesleyan
11-78	Black Studies	Denison
2-79	Advanced Consulting Skills	Lima, Ohio
2-79	Conference on Psychology	Albion
4-79	Conference on Advising	Wooster
4-79	Foreign Languages Conference	Denison
4-79	Sports and the Liberal Arts College	Hope
6-79	Workshop on Course Design and Teaching III	Kenyon
10-79	Social History	Conner Prairie
2-80	Developmental Theory	Dayton
4-80	Latin American Studies	Denison
4-80	Black Students on White Campuses	Wooster
4-80	Theatre	Albion
6-80	Workshop on Course Design and Teaching IV	Kenyon
10-80	ACM/GLCA Classicists	Lake Forest
10-80	Computers and the Liberal Arts College	Denison
11-80	Computers and the Liberal Arts College	Denison
2-81	Faculty Development at the Departmental Level	Columbus
4-81	Education and China (ACM/GLCA)	Wingspread
4-81	Foreign Languages--Introductory Course	Albion
6-81	Course Design and Teaching V	Kenyon
6-81	Cross-Disciplinary Writing	Albion
10-81	Feminist Perspectives on Literature	Wooster
10-81	Japan Teaching Materials (GLCA/ACM)	Earlham
2-82	Cross-Disciplinary Writing	Wooster
3-82	Cross-Cultural, International & Language Studies	Earlham

4-82	Nature of an Academic Career	Denison
4-82	GLCA Economists	Ohio Wesleyan
4-82	GLCA Psychologists	Wooster
6-82	Course Design and Teaching VI	Albion

Career Renewal and Change

By 1978, there was emerging a new need in faculty development which faculty and administrators struggled to define. In formal and informal discussions among faculty members and academic deans, there emerged an awareness that tenured professors who were in the middle of their careers were increasingly ambivalent about their situation. Most of them were living precisely the kind of life they had hoped for: teaching good students at good small liberal arts colleges. However, satisfaction was reduced by apprehension that, however pleasant their situation, they faced possibly as much as 30 more years of the same: teaching at the same college, in the same small town, with the same few departmental colleagues, and doing that with gradually declining compensation and possibly a decline in the quality of the students. Although hardly a widespread crisis, it did appear to be a problem that should be addressed before it attained such proportions. GLCA colleges are too dependent on high quality teaching to allow anything to jeopardize it.

There was also another, and related, problem. Most of the colleges planned no further growth, and some expected a decline in enrollment that would require some reduction in faculty size. Further, relatively few members of these faculties (particularly after the retirement age was raised to 70), would be reaching retirement age during the next decade and a half. This meant that there would be fewer and fewer opportunities to offer places—certainly not permanent and potentially tenured places—to new young teachers.

The possibility that the colleges might have to forgo their accustomed infusion of new young scholars, while at the same time retaining tenured faculty members who were dissatisfied with their careers, crystallized into the realization that if some older faculty could be assisted in making a career change, there would then be at least a few new places for younger faculty. Implicit in this approach too was the hope that many mid-career faculty, after appraising their life circumstances, would recommit themselves to their original goal of being outstanding teachers.

At about this time, Roger Baldwin, a doctoral candidate at The University of Michigan, began surveying GLCA faculties, applying theories of adult development to their career lines. Baldwin's dissertation lent support to the idea that adults change significantly over time and that at certain points early and late in their careers, they tend to reevaluate their vocational status and consider changes in career direction.

Thus reinforced in his own assessment, Fuller proposed to the Lilly Endowment that they support a year's planning and exploration to determine how GLCA could best respond to changing career patterns of faculty members. With a planning grant of $31,000, Fuller moved ahead by appointing a committee consisting of Louis Brakeman (Provost, Denison), James Hodges (History, Wooster), Phyllis Jones (English, Oberlin), Paul Lacey (English, Earlham), David Marker (Provost, Hope), Jack Morrill (Mathematics, DePauw), Kitty Padgett (Career Counseling, Albion), and Uwe Woltemade (Economics, Ohio Wesleyan). Also under terms of the grant, Judith Elkin (History, Albion) was hired on a part-time basis to ease the administrative overload in the Ann Arbor office.

During the calendar year 1980, a variety of activities were undertaken under direction of the advisory committee. Some committee members examined career renewal programs at other institutions. Brakeman utilized his sabbatical term to explore opportunities for faculty internships. Marker surveyed leave policies at GLCA colleges with a view to identifying institutional barriers to faculty mobility. Several biographies of career "changers" and "renewers" were commissioned and written, to be distributed as models to other faculty members. Two conferences on career renewal were held, in order to test reaction to some of the ideas that had surfaced.

At this writing, because outside funding has lapsed, the future of the program is uncertain. However, it may be argued that a prime objective has already been accomplished in that the subject—a touchy one among faculty members—has been legitimated.

Some Observations

Faculty development was an interest of GLCA from the start, but it took second place to the development of student programs. In the mid-seventies, emphasis shifted from supplying the needs of students for a diversified curriculum to understanding the needs of faculty if they were to keep that curriculum academically valid and methodologically innovative. Although the debates leading up to the present configuration of programs were diffuse, even tortuous, discussion served to involve faculty members from all disciplines and of all temperaments. And it was only through their involvement, as was recognized from the start, that growth and change could occur.

The grant from the Lilly Endowment turned out to be as influential on the development of GLCA as the earlier Ford Grant in Non-Western Studies had been. This effort moved GLCA away from its earlier concentration on off-campus education and expanded the range of its concerns to developments on campus. It marked a change from operations at the periphery of the curriculum toward operations at its core. Activating faculty who had not been reached by the international or thematic off-campus programs, it connected them directly to GLCA. It involved more faculty members more intensively than any other program to date, because it addressed issues which concerned them intimately: personal and professional growth.

Between February 1977 and June 1979, fifteen faculty development conferences were held. A total of 305 faculty members attended at least one of these, and 58 attended two or more. Three colleges were represented at all of these conferences, the lowest number participating at any one time being seven.

Since the level of activity has continued at the same pace since 1979, it is apparent that over 40% of all GLCA faculty members have attended at least one faculty development conference. Although a quantitative measure is of limited usefulness in gauging teaching vitality, it can be said that support has been consistent enough, over a sufficient period of time, to establish beyond a doubt that GLCA is concerned with good teaching.

The assumption of responsibility for faculty development altered the position of the vice president and fortified the role the central office plays within the consortium. Earlier vice presidents had operated as assistants to their presidents. But when Joe Rogers left in 1976 to take up a position in the federal government, Fuller specifically sought out as replacement a person with experience in faculty development. Once hired, Donn Neal was given total responsibility for this area. Neal, a former history professor from Elmira College, had been involved with faculty development programs at the College Center for the Finger Lakes, which sponsored perhaps the first faculty development program in a consortial setting. He took over with sufficient energy that faculty development came to be seen as his chief responsibility, establishing for the first time a direct link between the GLCA vice president and faculty members throughout the consortium. The position thus acquired an identity, a constituency and a mission of its own, apart from those of the president.

Placing faculty development in the GLCA office enabled the program to move forward with vigor. Because the office now sponsors multiple conferences in which many faculty members have a direct interest, there is more communication with faculty than previously, and a clearer perception of the consortium's relevance to teaching. This resulted in an incidental increment of authority to the central office, which seems not to have been an issue at the time.

Women's Studies

With the exception of Wabash, one of the few remaining all-male colleges in the country, all the GLCA colleges are coeducational. Kenyon, after 130 years of educating men, admitted women students for the first time in 1969. On the other hand, Oberlin graduated the first three women in America to receive the A.B. degree, in 1835; and Antioch was coeducational from the start. Not surprisingly, the twelve colleges exhibit the full range of relationships that characterize American campuses, from domination by Greek societies to prevalence of the work-study ethos; their student bodies range from preppie to anti-prep. It is therefore to be expected that the colleges would respond very differently to the feminist wave that swept the United States in the late sixties and early seventies.

A Women's Studies conference held in March 1976 as part of the faculty development series funded by the Lilly Endowment sparked consortium-wide interest in gender-related issues. The situation at that time included a combined student body of some 20,000, of whom nearly half were women; only 16% of faculty were. While 70% of male faculty were tenured, only 40% of female faculty had that status. (The proportions varied, of course, from one campus to another.) Women faculty members were able to advance to varying degrees, based on their competence, but there was little support or understanding for the human problems they faced, whether as single women living in small towns or as faculty wives tethered to one geographic area. Women students found few role models for the living of autonomous lives. Lack of concern for their special problems led to inadequate career counseling and ineffectual health care. This situation, far from being unique to GLCA campuses, was characteristic of American society as a whole. What was unique, was GLCA's response to it.

Realizing that the Earlham conference could become the starting point for a consortial approach to the subject, Beth Reed and a committee of women faculty began developing a network of women to strengthen Women's Studies (WS) by exchanging information and syllabi. A questionnaire identified their number one concern: faculty members engaged in WS had no knowledge of comparable developments on other campuses and sometimes suffered a severe sense of isolation as they pioneered a new field that was not widely regarded as academically respectable. Compounding their insecurity was their newness on their respective campuses, their youth compared to male colleagues, and their lack of tenure.

But the Earlham conference had tapped an enormous reservoir of energy and enthusiasm, for the material of WS was exceptional amoung the disciplines: it emerged from the practitioners' own lives. That same weekend, a committee began to plan for the coming academic year.[3] In September, Fuller made their appointments official, giving WS the same status as other consortial committees.

Several interrelated lines of action were adopted by the committee: WS curriculum development, teaching, and research; affirmative action on the campuses; and the quality of campus life. To ally with other WS faculty around the country, six committee members obtained the support of their colleges to attend the founding conference of the National Women's Studies Association, held in San Francisco in 1977.

That spring, a group chaired by Kaaren Courtney assembled a 57-page Women's Studies Resource Handbook which identified resources on each campus—courses

---

3. That first committee consisted of Stephanie Bennett (American Studies, Albion); Dianne Sadoff (Literature, Antioch); Margaret Berrio (Psychology, DePauw); Kitty Steele (English, DePauw); Ann Fitzgerald (English, Denison); Andrea Jacoby (English, Earlham); Marigene Arnold (Anthropology, Kalamazoo); Carol Libby (Chemistry, Kenyon); Paula Goldsmid (Associate Dean) and Harriet Turner (Romance Languages, Oberlin); Kaaren Courtney (Romance Languages, Ohio Wesleyan); Brenda Bankart (Psychology, Wabash); Judith Miller (French, Wooster); and Beth Reed for the GLCA Faculty Development Committee, with Jon Fuller ex officio. When Bennett left to assume a deanship at another institution, Barbara Keys (Psychology) was appointed in her place.

being taught, affirmative action personnel, library and audiovisual materials, student services, faculty and student women's organizations. A GLCA Women's Studies Newsletter was also published. Four committee meetings per year served to bring together a cadre of women faculty members who were concerned with feminist issues though still uncertain what they wanted to do about them. It was apparent that WS could not be developed in academic terms alone, for employment and tenure practices controlled the environment in which curriculum evolved, faculty taught, and students learned.

Preparing a proposal to fund the varied consortial activities stimulated the committee to think concretely about their objectives. Priority was given to a visible consortial program that could exert leverage on the status of WS on all the campuses. Next came the question as to whether the WS committee, primarily composed of untenured women who lacked status within their own institutions, could carry out such a program. Should the committee be restructured to bring in people of greater influence? This strategy was rejected, for the quality of the work seemed to depend on involving those most knowledgeable about and committed to WS goals. It is also apparent now that committee members were providing one another considerable personal support which they would have been loathe to lose, for it counteracted the isolation they felt on their own campuses and the skepticism with which WS frequently was met. They used committee meetings to discuss and assess their own employment status and strategies for improving it—for example, by negotiating permanent part-time positions and shared appointments. WS as an academic subject could not be detached from the lives of women. Committee members who were experiencing women's studies as an empowering force wanted to use this power to accomplish their own visibility and legitimacy. While they therefore kept their committee intact, they also sought out influential allies able to speak on behalf of women's studies from a more secure platform: a dean, a president, a department chair, or the head of an important committee who could effectively bring issues to the attention of faculty members whom the committee members themselves could not reach. Fortunately, such individuals were forthcoming on almost every campus.

The strongest ally of WS turned out to be Jon Fuller. Already sensitized to women's equity issues through his work at HEW, he had been appointed to the National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs by President Ford in 1974. Now, as president of GLCA, he was receptive to the possibility of consortial WS activities, and lent his support to the committee to the extent that when a proposal deadline closed in, he typed the application himself.

In spring 1977, with Lilly funds soon to run out and FIPSE funding still uncertain, Fuller guaranteed several months of the coordinator's salary and a small budget for the committee to tide the project over during a continuing search for funds. The offer turned out not to be needed. The grant was funded in August and a separate WS Program, housed in the GLCA central office, was established with Reed as coordinator.

Over the next two years, WS undertook a vast array of projects. Two "annual" conferences were held in one calendar year, attracting a larger attendance than any other faculty development event before or since. The April 1978 theme, "Women's Life/Work," attracted 150 faculty, administrators, and students. That for November 1978 focused on "The Structure of Knowledge: A Perspective," and was attended by two hundred. Publication of its proceedings gave visibility to the program nationwide. In addition, 9 weekend conferences and workshops were held.

+ interdisciplinary women's studies curriculum development conference
+ feminist literary criticism workshop
+ National Science Foundation workshop on women in science
+ women's studies workshop for librarians
+ racism/sexism workshop for faculty, students, and administrators
+ leadership development workshop for the Women's Studies Committee
+ workshop on the hiring and retention of women faculty and administrators
+ two student conferences

Mini-grants, which had worked well in the case of the Carnegie Grant for the Humanities, were also utilized for WS. On the basis of faculty and/or student proposals, grants ranging from $50 to $300 each were allocated in support of such diverse projects as a library instruction course in women's studies research, a women's career day for students, a math anxiety workshop for faculty, and development of a women's history slide bank. Men have been involved in these activities since the Earlham conference, and a few male faculty members have established credentials in women's studies.

The 1978 Resource Handbook was twice the size of the first edition, attesting to the growth in women's studies and services. It included women's studies program descriptions, potential speakers and consultants from the colleges and their surrounding communities, special library and audiovisual resources, feminist publications and organizations, a report on the status of Title IX, names of affirmative action officers, administrative policies regarding parental and maternity leaves, search and hiring procedures for faculty and administrators, a survey of part-time, full-status positions, and a model WS syllabus. Obviously, the consortial link was transmitting feminist energies from one campus to another.

During academic year 1978-79, Florence Howe, former president of the Modern Languages Association and founder of the Feminist Press, was GLCA Visiting Scholar in Women's Studies, with partial support from the FIPSE grant. Working with Reed and the committee, she contributed to the annual conference and workshops, visiting most of the GLCA colleges to lecture and work with faculty. Residing one semester each at Oberlin and Denison, she taught an undergraduate WS course and conducted an interdisciplinary faculty seminar. While students no doubt benefited from her presence, the greatest gain was in faculty and administrative respect for the new discipline. Howe's lecture on "Breaking the Disciplines," delivered at Oberlin, was a landmark in the history of women's studies. Focusing on that college's claim to have pioneered in coeducation, Howe questioned the very concept of "co" education, applied as it is to women, not to men, and challenged her listeners to break out of the androcentric molds in which the disciplines traditionally have been cast.

Evaluators who visited each college early in the project and again after funding had terminated, looking for changes that had taken place in the intervening two years, found striking differences as well as common themes.[4] While the twelve colleges varied greatly in their objectives for WS curriculum development and in the number of WS courses they offered, "mainstreaming"—the incorporation of WS material into ongoing courses—was increasingly the predominant theme. In some instances, this resulted from opposition to separate courses on women; in others, it was the preferred route, particularly as enrollment and budgetary constraints limited the number of new faculty hired. Few people were likely to be employed on their strength as feminist scholars. The curriculum would remain male-oriented unless existing faculty integrated feminist scholarship into their courses.

The evaluators suggested several interrelated factors that contribute to successful WS; primary among these, acceptance of its academic legitimacy. This requires administrative support, including a budgeted position of WS coordinator, and encouragement of faculty members to enter the new field.

During this period, even as GLCA colleges increased their efforts to hire women faculty, they were still few in number and seldom full professors or department chairs. In these small communities, retention of women faculty remained a problem. Some men continued to feel awkward around women colleagues, and as often as not shut them out of lines of communication. The evaluators suggested that getting more men involved in WS would be helpful and would also relieve women faculty members of the sole burden of establishing the new discipline. The evaluators noted hopeful signs: an increase in women on some faculties; improved physical education programs and facilities for women on some campuses; establishment of an information network among librarians; and increased attention to career counseling for women students. Looking to the eighties, the evaluators urged on the colleges a three-part program: adequate policies for part-time, full-status faculty and administrative positions; more women in cabinet-level positions; and serious attention to alleviating male-female tensions on campus.

Participants in the 1981 Women's Studies Conference. The T-shirts memorialize a fictitious college located at the geographic center of GLCA territory.

With the expiration of FIPSE funding, Reed turned to the Ford Foundation. GLCA was awarded a grant to survey WS programs in small undergraduate institutions across the country, with a view to determining how--with few women on their faculties, limited financial resources, and a traditional ethos--they could meet the challenge posed by the changing relationship between the sexes. In all, there were 357 respondents from 228 institutions in 40 states and the District of Columbia. The major needs that emerged were for time to conduct research and develop courses; and for a sense of academic legitimacy. Both were necessary if departments were to offer WS courses on a continuing basis; both were necessary if colleges were to challenge the narrowing career orientation of students.

---

[4] They were Hannah Goldberg (Dean, Antioch), Vivian Holliday (Dean of Faculty, Wooster), John Miller (English, Denison), Jack Padgett (Philosophy, Albion), and Ellen Henle (Assistant Dean, Oberlin).

The latter, although a topic of major concern to liberal education generally, is vital to WS since career-oriented students choose courses directly related to their choice of occupation, and WS courses rarely are. Other students see WS as personal and political statements. Assuming that "women's rights" have been won, they regard WS as no longer needed. Yet other women students, particularly those raised in traditional homes, fear that enrolling in WS courses will label them as man-haters or lesbians. It follows that one way to enhance the legitimacy of WS and make it easier for students to enroll is to appoint a WS coordinator with credibility among the faculty and the administration.

The results of the survey brought home the need for a structured exploration of critical theory and practical issues related to teaching and curricular development. Most small institutions are not in a position to hire discretionary new faculty; yet existing faculty have not the time or the resources to prepare new WS courses or to review their ongoing courses from a feminist perspective. What followed was creation of a National Summer Institute, at which participants collaborated on the development of new courses, revision of traditional courses, and developing WS resources for use by faculty. Forty-five faculty members from all regions of the United States and even from Great Britain, Switzerland, and the Netherlands representing diverse diciplines and different sorts of institutions, participated in the first such institute in the summer of 1981 on the campus of The University of Michigan. A Lilly grant helped launch this project. Designed as a national event, the planning committee included both GLCA and non-GLCA personnel.[5] The Institute led to extensive reexamination of the content and perspective of entire courses in order to "break the disciplines"—to eradicate the androcentric foundations of classical pedagogy and restructure knowledge from the inside out.

---

5. Elizabeth Douvan of The University of Michigan's Committee for Gender Studies; Margaret Fete (Romance Languages, Ohio Wesleyan), Ann Fitzgerald (Assistant to the President, Denison), Lisa Godfrey (Director of Instructional Services, Kalamazoo); Eva Hooker, C.S.C. (Associate Dean of Faculty, Saint Mary's College); Katie Herzfeld (Antioch student and GLCA Women's Studies Assistant); Valerie Lee (English and Black Studies, Denison); Elizabeth K. Minnich (Dean of the east coast region of Union Graduate School and coordinator of its doctoral program in women's studies); Nancy Nowik (English, Denison); Stephanie Riger (Psychology, Lake Forest College); and Joan Straumanis (Philosophy, Denison).

Having guided the WS program this far, Reed now announced her intention to move forward in her own career development. The WS committee took this opportunity to petition the GLCA Board to fund a permanent half-time position as WS coordinator. The Board agreed, for a trial period. By accepting the commitment, the Board also accepted its two corollaries: a willingness to see the curriculum restructured in the light of feminist scholarship, and an effort to attain greater equity in issues relating to gender.

Considering that the WS program was patently subversive, the support of the Board indicates considerable flexibility on the part of the presidents, all of whom are middle-aged and male. None of the colleges have a volume of federal contracts large enough to being them under affirmative action regulations, yet several have committed themselves voluntarily to such plans. The Board, in supporting WS, was placing a burr under its own saddle.

Earlier, the Board had given a courteous hearing when Ann Fuller and Nancy Wenzlau expressed their concern about the expectations laid upon them as presidents' wives although they had in no sense been hired by their colleges nor were they recompensed for their efforts or their loss of privacy. In 1973, these stirrings had led to no practical result. Now, the times were ripe. In just six years, a committee of women faculty members, most of whom lacked secure status on their home campuses, led by a coordinator who began with no previous WS experience and who found her funds as she went along, had achieved recognition of their work and secured a commitment to its continuation. It was a splendid example of the association's capacity to respond to faculty needs, even if doing so meant growing new limbs in the process.

Nationally, GLCA is now recognized as a pioneer in a faculty development approach to issues of gender equity. On the campuses, nevertheless, much remains to be done. In academic year 1981-82, only one-fifth of GLCA faculties (306) were female, with 200 of these at the asistant professor level or below and for the most part untenured. While almost all the women at associate or full professor rank are tenured, among temporary hires there is a cohort of women who are experiencing problems that are yet to be addressed.

While generally positive, the situation at present exhibits areas susceptible of improvement. Entire curricula have not undergone a feminist transformation, many faculty members and administrators continue to resist change, and the higher towers of administrative bastions have not yet yielded to assault. There are no women presidents at GLCA colleges, there is just one female chief academic officer, and GLCA itself has yet to hire its first female president or vice president. But a start has been made. If there is truth in the aphorism that there is no more powerful force than an idea whose time has arrived, it must be acknowledged that GLCA has known how to harness that force to its own advantage and the advantage of its faculties.

GLCA in the Seventies

GLCA was maturing and acquiring a different aspect in the seventies. It had begun in the sixties as a presidents' club, whose principals shared a somewhat vague agreement that cooperation was a good thing. Very quickly, it came to be used as a coordinating body for international education. The domestic thematic programs never seated themselves at the heart of the GLCA operation, probably because they could be administered efficiently from other locations. The central office was for long perceived as a convenient place to keep the books, and each time a president departed, the Board was in no hurry to replace him. Instead, the administrative officer was placed in the breach, amid discussion as to whether GLCA really needed a president.

Three programs altered this attitude. One was faculty development, which caused GLCA to become more of a membership organization capable of attracting the allegiance of faculty members. The second was women's studies, through which the consortium began to act as an agent of social and academic change on campus. The third was legislative representation, Fuller's distinctive contribution to the life of GLCA. Taken together, these new responsibilities confirmed the need for the continued existence of the consortium by giving it a set of functions which no other organization was able to perform.

CHAPTER V

GLCA ENTERS THE NATIONAL SCENE

The interim presidency of Larry Barrett provided time for the members of the Board to consider the course the consortium was on and opportunity to chart a new one. Recent changes in the makeup of the Board had not yet been assimilated. There had been substantial turnover among presidents: Joel Smith came new to Denison, Tom Wenzlau to Ohio Wesleyan, and Thad Seymour to Wabash, and all three attended their first Board meeting in November 1969. During their early years, their energies went toward managing student unrest on the campus. In relation to these central concerns, GLCA seemed peripheral, at best a diversion from the business at hand.

The March 1970 Board meeting was held at Jewfish Cay in the Bahamas, where Earlham maintained a marine biology station. The informal setting encouraged the growth of friendship among these men, who faced similar problems and generally lacked confidants on their own campuses. When George Rainsford, the new president of Kalamazoo, joined the Board two years later, this congenial group developed a style somewhat different from that of their predecessors.

The issues before them in 1973 involved not so much GLCA's internal evolution as its relationship to the rest of the world of higher education. These issues were: the desirability of arranging some form of representation in Washington; a possible merger with ACM; GLCA's place in the mosaic of organizations involved in the politics of higher education; and the selection of a new president. Although it was not immediately apprehended, these four issues all hinged on one another.

The key issue was the possibility of consolidation with ACM.[1] Some Board members considered the presidential vacancy an opportunity to examine whether the same benefits that flowed from an association of twelve colleges might not be doubled in an association of twenty-four. The two consortia had already acted jointly to express dissatisfaction over the way in which the interests of the small liberal arts colleges were being represented by the Association of American Colleges (AAC).[2] As a result, GLCA had recently joined ACM in the operation of a separate Washington office. Merger talks were therefore opened; but while merger was pending, no permanent president could be recruited, since it was not known what he would be asked to become president of. Finally, the negotiations with ACM concerning a merger clarified for the Board the purpose of the consortium, the direction in which they now wanted to take it, the type of president who should be elected, and a commitment to maintain the Association's historic identity.

---

[1] ACM had a less definitive vision of its boundaries than had GLCA; Its original ten members had been joined by Macalester and Colorado in 1969; six years later, Lake Forest became a member.

[2] AAC had begun as an association of independent colleges, but had expanded to take in public institutions as well. The more heterogeneous AAC became, the more cross-pressured it grew, so that it became less well able to address public policy issues from the perspective of the independents.

Barrett's year as acting president, notable in itself for the impulse given to faculty development, can therefore be seen from an institutional point of view as a pause in the forward momentum of the consortium. Rethinking and realigning its priorities, the Board eventually reached a set of decisions which determined a new course for GLCA.

The Issue of Washington Representation

During the presidency of Eldon Johnson, GLCA relied on existing organizations such as AAC and ACE (American Council on Education) to advise on legislation affecting liberal arts institutions. Professional associations were assumed to provide adequate information on federal activities relating to specific disciplines. Johnson, in harmony with Board members at that time, did not see the need for direct consortial representation in Washington.

By 1967, however, a number of GLCA presidents were beginning to experience just this need. In pushing for more focused representation of the interests of the independent colleges, the lead was taken by Weimer Hicks, president of Kalamazoo College and an influential member of the Board. In what has come to be remembered as the Hicksite Rebellion, he endeavored unsuccessfully to persuade the then president of AAC to his point of view. AAC, however, declined to risk the loss of its public members by identifying with the private sector.

In 1968, the two consortia made frantic efforts to modify proposed legislation which provided that federal science grants to universities and colleges be based on a distributive formula rather than competition by merit.[3] In a joint statement, the presidents of all the ACM and GLCA colleges charged that the bill favored research and graduate study at large universities at the expense of colleges engaged in undergraduate education. Its issuance during AAC's annual meeting is evidence that ACM/GLCA had been unable to achieve agreement on this position by the larger organization. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 and the Presidential veto of the budget of Health, Education, and Welfare in Spring, 1970, also elicited emergency lobbying efforts from the two consortia.

The controversy was still simmering when Henry Acres assumed the GLCA presidency. In the face of fears that the golden years of government support might be waning, Acres, along with several GLCA college presidents, advocated adopting the strongest possible political defense of their interests. A resolution drafted jointly by representatives of GLCA and ACM in January 1970 urged that AAC be empowered to assess and vigorously advance the special needs of the independents. But despite his close friendship with Frederick Ness, who had by then succeeded to the presidency of AAC, Acres failed to persuade that organization of the desirability of moving AAC back to its original base among the independent colleges.

---

[3] H.R. 875, 90th Congress, 2nd session (1968), called the "Miller Bill."

If not AAC, then perhaps a joint venture with ACM might be feasible. GLCA's sister consortium already had an office in Washington, directed by Ida Wallace, an Oberlin alumna and former newspaper reporter. Established in March 1966, the mission of the office was to keep track of federal programs designed to assist colleges and to help them take advantage of new opportunities. The origins of this office lay in the Higher Education Act of 1965, which recognized higher education as a major factor in securing the "peace and welfare" of the nation.

When the science education programs of NSF appeared threatened, Ida Wallace orchestrated the appearance of six ACM/GLCA presidents to testify on its behalf before the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development. (These were, for GLCA, Henry Acres, Landrum Bolling, and James Dixon; for ACM, Summer Hayward, Bernard Adams and Miller Upton). Acres, who was carrying on a voluminous correspondence with officials in government and higher education nationwide, spent an increasing proportion of his time bringing GLCA political positions to their attention. But the Ann Arbor office had not been set up for legislative representation, and Acres also had responsibility for the day-to-day running of the consortium. It was beginning to seem more and more inefficient to mobilize resources only when an emergency erupted. Would it not be better to install a regular system to monitor and organize a rapid response? Garber Drushal of Wooster, who had begun with the belief that legislative representation was best left to AAC or ACE, ended by making a strong case for joining ACM's Washington office: "I am quite convinced that the freestanding, liberal arts college needs a strong voice in Washington." Other presidents who supported this position included Bolling, Wenzlau of Ohio Wesleyan, Seymour of Wabash, and Smith of Denison—the freshmen.

At a meeting with ACM held in September 1971 to discuss the Washington office, GLCA representatives stated their interest in activities designed to clarify and publicize their views on legislation affecting higher education, as well as to keep track of federal programs affecting their institutions. The mandate to the existing ACM office, however, did not authorize direct representation. ACM college presidents, who were presenting testimony before Congressional committees three or four times a year, wanted to retain this activity within their sole jurisdiction. Despite these differences, the two groups, believing they had more in common than not, agreed to begin negotiations toward achieving a partnership. The GLCA executive committee, meeting the following month, recommended joining the ACM office, retaining Ida Wallace in charge of an expanded staff; it also recommended that a committee be set up to discuss total merger of the two consortia.

Three of the colleges—Kenyon, Albion, and Hope—objected to the proposed Washington arrangement. Various reasons were advanced by their Presidents, William Caples, Bernard Lomas, and Gordon Van Wylen: skepticism that "yet another" Washington office could be more effectual than those already there; little empirical evidence that a proprietary Washington office would enhance the ability of the colleges to draw on Federal funds; and an ideological preference for working with state legislatures.

Taking the position that the future of the consortium was more important than a quick decision, Board President Joel Smith called a moratorium while the presidents discussed the matter informally among themselves. By April 1972 they were able to agree on an agreement to disagree, and unanimously passed a resolution to enter into partnership with ACM in operating the Washington office for a trial period of two years, provided nine members chose to participate. Half the office's expenses were assumed by GLCA, prorated among participating institutions. The policy of the newly named Midwest Colleges Office was to be set by a joint committee comprised of the president, board chairman, and two additional board members from each association.

Should GLCA Merge with ACM?

Once the possibility of ACM/GLCA cooperation in a Washington office was proposed, discussion widened into a consideration of the merits of consolidating the two consortia entirely. They had much in common: their member colleges all emerged from similar traditions and shared the same unswerving commitment to quality liberal arts education; ACM had been in on the founding of GLCA; and informal consultation was already a familiar mode for them.

In November 1972, the GLCA Board asked a committee of its members to meet with ACM Board members to discuss the possibilities for cooperation on additional matters of mutual interest. Were there other projects that could be better accomplished through cooperation? If so, what were the implications for the sovereignty of each group?

Kerstetter of DePauw, Rainsford of Kalamazoo, Seymour of Wabash, Smith of Denison, Van Wylen of Hope, Wenzlau of Ohio Wesleyan, and Henry Acres accordingly met with their opposite numbers in San Francisco the following January, and again in Chicago a few months later. After six months of discussion, Smith, who was now chairman of the GLCA Board, summarized in a letter to Rainsford and Wenzlau the advantages and disadvantages of merger. On one level, the advantages and disadvantages of merger with ACM were relatively straightforward. The advantages included:

1. A larger base from which to draw students for the academic program.
2. Some economies of scale, most especially with respect to administrative costs, e.g., salaries and office expense.
3. The possibility that a larger organization would somehow find the strength to take on the responsibility of strengthening the voice of private liberal arts colleges with respect to the formulation of public policy.

But the possible disadvantages were also quite easy to identify:

1. The styles of the two consortia are very different, e.g., central office vs. agency administration.

2. The geographical range of participating institutions could be a problem.
3. The personal associations which are so important might be more difficult to develop given the involvement of so many more people.

Underlying these accessible issues, Smith identified more fundamental ones. The overseas programs—the great consortium builders of the past—would not expand in the foreseeable future: member institutions could not tolerate the potential loss of tuition income resulting from more students going off-campus. At the same time, the institutions were feeling a stronger need than ever to pool their resources in order to face an uncertain financial and political future. "If we focus on new possibilities," concluded Smith, "I believe those possibilities are more promising if the two consortia do them together, perhaps as one entity."

A second fundamental issue on which Smith believed cooperation necessary was representation of private liberal arts colleges. Over the next several years, the most significant policy question would be resolved, namely, whether governmental aid would go predominantly to students or to institutions. "The public institutions," Smith wrote, "have a very effective lobby, as we know, and they will press strenuously for aid to institutions. Who will speak on behalf of the principle of aid to students? While I respect the improvement in governmental relations work of AAC, I believe that AAC is effectively neutralized on this classic issue because its membership includes both public and private institutions. Thus, I think we must find some way to speak forcefully, and I believe that the consolidation of ACM and GLCA would be a larger step toward that very important possibility."

Smith believed that the right kind of leadership could overcome the problems inherent in coordinating 24 sovereign colleges; and that, moreover, strong leadership might counteract the weakening loyalty to the consortium of some of the colleges and their possible withdrawal.

"That centrifugal force," he asserted, "can be intercepted if we move effectively to the next level of activity."

Over the summer of 1973, a sort of interregnum prevailed within GLCA, with Rogers acting as program officer and Mouilso as fiscal officer. There was talk of allowing the consortium to continue at this caretaker level. In August, a special meeting of the Board at Detroit Metropolitan Airport, originally scheduled as a presidential search committee, was given over to discussion of a possible merger with ACM. There was a clear consensus that some sort of joint activity was essential. The question was whether GLCA should continue as then constituted, or look to a new 24-institution group, with all the open questions that entailed. Until this question was answered, it was certainly not possible to recruit a permanent president, since any candidate's first question would be whether his role was only to hand over the keys.

Reports of the meetings with ACM showed enthusiasm for consolidation among all who participated. A sharing of facts on budget, organization and personnel demonstrated that presumed differences of style were not as sharp as originally believed. While ACM in general used the central office and GLCA the agency style of program development and mangement, neither style in fact was pure. At its central office, ACM had one more person than GLCA. Institutional assessments were $15,000 for ACM, $14,000 for GLCA (the Washington office assessment being part of the general assessment for ACM and a separate $4,000 item added to the $10,000 basic assessment for GLCA).

The Executive Committee also reported at this time ACM's stipulation that Dan Martin become president of a joint organization, and that headquarters be in Chicago. This stipulation, imposed by ACM because of considerations of equity to Martin, who had just been hired, generated a perception that GLCA was being asked to submerge its identity in ACM rather than to participate in a consolidation of two equal partners.

Nevertheless, the GLCA Board moved to endorse further conversations focused on the following issues: 1) the difficulties presented by ACM's identification of a president in advance of detailed discussions about the purpose of the new organization; 2) recognition of the distinction between consolidation and merger, and GLCA's interest in the former, not the latter; 3) the desirability that the vice president of the new organization, who would presumably be in charge of academic programs, should be familiar with GLCA; 4) allowance for regional activity by colleges located close together; 5) flexibility in merging the central vs. agency style of management with the expectation that some of the agencies would remain in existence for a while; 6) the need for faculty participation in the governance of the new organization (which GLCA had, but ACM did not). These desiderata established, the Board appointed Barrett acting president, with a mandate to work out the consolidation.

Word that GLCA was willing to continue negotiations prompted an immediate response from Martin, who began sending over the financial and other information necessary for further negotiation. Barrett, for his part, had to operate on two tracks simultaneously. On the assumption the consolidation would go through, the interim president had to tread gingerly, taking no steps that might foreclose options. On the assumption the consolidation would fail, he had to exercise enough leadership to maintain GLCA's momentum and prevent it falling into disarray. We have seen that faculty development constituted just such an initiative. He personally believed an ACM merger was viable. The benefits of belonging to a larger group seemed so patent that, should a partnership with ACM not work out, Barrett believed GLCA should look elsewhere—possibly toward the east, where many of the colleges recruited their students. Or, GLCA could expand locally by taking in other colleges in Michigan, Ohio and Indiana.

Evaluating the Washington Connection

As Barrett and Martin continued their discussions, the date approached for evaluation of the Midwest Colleges Office (MCO). Since this was an area of ongoing cooperation between the two, the evaluation was important for gauging not only the intrinsic value of the Washington office, but also the potential for a productive partnership with ACM.

With merger negotiations still going on, Barrett, Paul Lacey (Provost of Earlham) and Thaddeus Seymour (President of Wabash) were asked by the Board to gather the information necessary to determine whether the Washington connection should be continued or terminated. While the committee interviewed persons who had made use of the office, Barrett held intensive discussions with Dan Martin. The two agreed that MCO was needed for both legislative representation and grantsmanship. Balancing the two functions, however, was another matter. To reconcile them was difficult for MCO, especially after the ACM Board reaffirmed its directive against lobbying by anyone except the college presidents.

MCO's first annual report showed that together the two consortia had received over a million dollars in federal funds for fiscal 1972-73, including half a million dollars each from NSF and NEH. These funds were granted in response to proposals that originated on the various campuses. As Wallace put it, "Imagination, innovation, creativity and educational validity emerge from the campus. The Washington office offers only a specialized kind of expertise and recognition which can help channel those attributes into successful proposals." These could succeed, however, only when federal funds were available. Wallace therefore continued arranging for Board members to testify in the name of both consortia on behalf of the National Science Foundation, and in particular in support of its budget for science education. When Congress considered legislation affecting the status of philanthropic foundations, MCO arranged for Thad Seymour to testify in the name of all 24 ACM/GLCA colleges. In his testimony (the data for which were compiled by MCO), Seymour stated that, for the decade 1959-69, the twelve colleges and central office of GLCA had received more than $42 million in foundation grants—almost 10% of the $432 million received from all sources. By 1974, there were few unbelievers in the GLCA camp: to ensure the revenue that had become so important a part of their budgets, they must support the agencies, both private and governmental, that supported liberal arts colleges. GLCA continued its relationship with MCO.

The Decision Against Merger

In November 1973, ACM/GLCA merger talks blew up. The reasons, though varied, certainly included the stipulation of Martin's assuming the presidency, because of the implication that GLCA would be joining ACM While the economics of joint operation were a strong argument in favor, there was apprehension over the westward shift entailed by consolidation, since Barrett and others believed GLCA's strongest potential market lay in the east. And there was friction between the two administrative styles. Centralization threatened various interests within GLCA: faculty members and presidents who believed deeply in the agency style of management resisted the merger. As negotiations came down to the wire, personalities also became a factor. But as Wenzlau points out, "the decision not to merge was not a negative one. We both thought we could accomplish some goals together without merging and without acquiring more baggage."

This view is confirmed by the increase in joint activities between the two consortia after the negotiations broke down. Rogers invited his opposite number, Patrick Haithcox, to attend an International Education Committee meeting; the two vice presidents held a discussion of their mutual interests in China; GLCA and ACM collaborated on a conference on Japanese studies held at Wingspread. Proposals flew back and forth for starting up new programs in Iran, Indonesia, Japan, Poland, as well as a joint approach to NEH on funding needs. The two consortia also began advertising on one another's campuses for resident directors of their science programs at Argonne and Oak Ridge. GLCA continued to support MCO. Meaningful cooperation at the administrative level continued to grow, with Mouilso exchanging with her opposite number the minutiae of daily business contacts: college catalogs, telephone directories, and an annual joint survey of faculty and administrative pay scales.

New Directions for GLCA

The year-long negotiations with ACM served to crystallize GLCA's identity. The consortium members did not want to lose by merger, even with so compatible a group as ACM, the reality of their association. The dispute regarding the uses to which the Washington office should be put had clearly placed the majority of GLCA's Board on record as favoring representation of their colleges' public policy interests. There was no preconception of how this should be done—through AAC, ACM, or other means—but there was a growing perception that it should be done. Internally, a zest appeared in the deliberations concerning faculty development, and it seemed fairly certain that funds were on the way to fortify decisions made in that area.

Senator Robert Griffin (R. Mich.) receiving a GLCA delegation in his Capitol Hill office in 1977, while he was serving as minority whip. Left to right: *Sen. Griffin, Jon Fuller, George Rainsford (President, Kalamazoo College), Bernard Lomas (President, Albion College).*

Thus, by the end of 1973, the way was becoming clear for selection of a new president to head a revitalized GLCA. The Board sought a man who could participate advantageously on the Washington scene and one who could become a respected spokesman for liberal arts education. They found their leader in Jon Fuller, who knew small colleges and who had served as special assistant to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. That he had been brought to Smith's attention by Dan Martin seemed, considering all the circumstances, quite appropriate. Fuller was elected president of GLCA in February 1974 and assumed office in July.

The new direction of GLCA was symbolized by three actions of the new president in the early months of his administration: suspending the Beirut program, accepting the Lilly grant in support of faculty development, and working out a viable relationship with MCO. The closing down of Beirut was a yielding to circumstance. The Lilly grant had already been negotiated; Fuller's contribution to it was to structure it permanently into the consortium. The politics of higher education proved to be the new president's forte.

At the December 1974 Board meeting, held in Washington so that the new president might be introduced to the national higher education community, Fuller outlined a two-tier relationship with MCO, developed in consultation with Martin and Wallace. GLCA would pay $12,000 annually for various MCO services: reporting on legislative and regulatory developments; coordination of joint efforts to present GLCA testimony; information on grant opportunities; and a Washington base of operations for faculty and administrators. This amount would be raised through $1,000 assessments on each college.

Any college desiring individual assistance in grant preparation and evaluation could pay an additional $3500 fee annually for more intensive service. This two-tier plan was approved by the Board, Caples dissenting. The colleges indicated by mail ballot the type of affiliation desired, and when the votes were in, six—Denison, DePauw, Hope, Kalamazoo, Ohio Wesleyan, and Wabash—opted for the $1000 level of support and four—Antioch, Earlham, Oberlin, and Wooster—for the full-service $4500 level. Albion and Kenyon opted out.

At this late date, there was still hope that the AAC would either reconsitute its membership or reorient its policies so as to speak with an undivided voice for the independent colleges. The National Representation Project, under direction of Edgar Carlson, had been commissioned to study the best way to represent liberal arts and independent education at the national level, and was soon to report its findings back to the AAC. But at the December 1975 meeting of the GLCA Board, Drushal, Wallin and Fuller brought in a pessimistic report on Carlson's conclusions: it was unlikely that AAC would become the kind of representational organ that was needed. Furthermore, any new organization that might arise as a result would most likely represent the full range of independents, with no guarantee that colleges like those in ACM and GLCA would be able to make their voices heard.

As a result, the three recommended, and the Board decided,

A. That GLCA give increased attention to the collective representation of our interests in Federal policy, and that the President of GLCA take responsibility to monitor events in Washington and to coordinate appropriate action by our colleges.

B. That the presidents of the member colleges agree to make themselves available for appropriate action on behalf of our collective interests in Washington.

C. That the President of GLCA negotiate an arrangement with the Associated Colleges of the Midwest so that the Midwestern Colleges Office will be available to provide staff support to the GLCA in the collective representation of the interests of its member colleges, and also continue to provide "grantsmanship" services to those member colleges who elect to pay an additional fee.

This delegation of responsibility to Fuller conformed with the new president's own views of what his priorities should be, and took advantage of the skills he brought to the presidency. A round of calls MCO had set up for Board members with congressional representatives, officials of NEH, and Terrel Bell, Commissioner of Education and Fuller's former colleague, made believers of any who still had doubts of the efficacy of a Washington connection. GLCA was now fully committed to active representation of its interests in Washington.

But within three months, the understanding with ACM was coming unstuck. The ACM Board reaffirmed its belief that grantsmanship should be the primary focus of MCO. Fuller, on the other hand, interpreted the mandate of the GLCA Board to mean priority for public policy concerns, with the opportunity for those colleges paying for it to get intensive grants assistance. Ida Wallace, attempting to straddle the two positions, found herself more in agreement with the latter than the former.

With the two approaches diverging at an accelerating rate, MCO split into its component parts. ACM continued its Washington office at the level of grantsmanship, while GLCA decided on a Washington base that would respond to its own perceptions of need. Wallace chose to go with GLCA, believing that the two functions were really inseparable, that grantsmanship availed not if the enabling legislation was not there, and that this legislation would provide a more congenial context for her clients if they had a voice in shaping it.

The Independent Colleges Office

In July 1976, the Independent Colleges Office (ICO) came into being, with GLCA, Reed College and Wittenberg University as its constituents and Ida Wallace as its director. By the end of 1981, ICO was covering legislative activities for all the GLCA colleges and providing full services—that is, extensive grants information and assistance with proposals—to the GLCA office, to Denison, Earlham, Kenyon, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Beloit, Reed, and St. Olaf Colleges. ICO became an independent agency in 1979, but continues to function as GLCA's Washington office. In a move which seemed to bring the consortia full circle, ACM arranged to buy the full range of services from ICO starting in January 1982.

Operating with only a director and one assistant, Karen Davis, ICO provides four categories of support: information on federal grants and services, lobbying, grantsmanship, and logistics. Ida Wallace provides subscribers with detailed memos on legislative and policy issues pending before Congress and executive or regulatory agencies. She also reports on activities and discussions inside the other Washington-based associations involved in higher education. Knowing the colleges well, she is able to identify issues of importance to them, allowing lead time in the making of policy decisions.

Action to influence the formation of public policy means identifying opportunities to testify, making arrangements for testimony, suggesting witnesses, assisting in drafting testimony, and following up in meetings with congressional staff. Wallace represents GLCA at meetings with other Washington-based groups and negotiates with congressional and agency staff on the wording of legislation or regulations. She also forwards information in the other direction, supplying congressional staff, federal agencies, or other associations with information about the GLCA colleges.

In counseling on grants, ICO alerts GLCA staff to funding possibilities, provides timely warning of deadlines, identifies any hidden agenda at the granting agencies, and advises on the preparation of specific proposals. A measure of ICO's success is the more than $2,500,000 in NSF grants made to the twelve GLCA colleges during 1978-80. Without GLCA's leadership in support of NSF science education, some of these programs probably would not exist, and the total appropriations for science education would certainly be smaller than they have been.

Logistical support involves arranging appointments and preparing briefing materials for the GLCA president and members of the Board, and arranging Washington meetings. It has also involved supplying NSF with dossiers of GLCA scientists qualified to serve on review panels.

In a recent three-month period, ICO reported to GLCA on the following matters:

- discussions with the International Communication Agency concerning a possible role for GLCA faculty members and administrators as consultants in developing international exchange concepts
- the impact on higher education of block grants to the states
- a protest to the Department of Education containing an analysis of unfavorable regulations pertaining to Language and Area Centers
- the availability of funds for science education
- selected federal programs of support to institutions of higher education, with imminent deadlines

- policy views of prospective candidates for political appointment
- NSF programs gleaned from discussions with officials, members of congress and their staffs, and public print
- applications for various federal grants, with a memorandum on changed deadlines and priorities

It is GLCA legislative policy to emphasize aid to students rather than to institutions as the primary means of federal support (with the inescapable corollary of survival determined by the market). Accepting the need to hold down federal spending, ICO works toward building support for programs that reward excellence, determined by peer review.

Since ICO represents only independent undergraduate colleges with strong academic credentials in the liberal arts, its point of view on issues in higher education is unified. It has escaped the cross-pressure of competing interests that characterizes higher education's great umbrella organizations. To maintain this unity, GLCA retains informal veto power over the acceptance of new clients by ICO. The two-tier plan for affiliation enables each college to choose between what it does for itself, and what it does consortially. Colleges which do not seek Federal grants need not pay for this service; yet they can participate in the network of political information emanating from ICO.

As principal staff member for monitoring federal policy, Wallace communicates directly with the college presidents and with Fuller; Board members communicate formally and informally with both Fuller and Wallace, and the two remain in touch on a weekly or, if necessary, continuous basis. ICO's output forms the basis for many of Fuller's policy decisions; but Fuller shapes the direction in which ICO will exert pressure, as in the decision to concentrate on saving NSF science programs when both NSF and NEH were threatened with severe cutbacks. While an occasional issue may go before the Board, the growing legislative history and increasing confidence in Fuller's judgment enable him to make decisions first and obtain ratification later. These decisions must, however, be solidly based in the consortium's essential interests, for the GLCA president, like the UN secretary general, lacks any enforcement power.

GLCA's Washington Network

Today, GLCA is an active participant in the national higher education enterprise. Jon Fuller, relying on the staff work of ICO, has become personally involved in a number of federal policy issues. Both institutionally and in the person of its chief officers, GLCA is integrated with the major relevant associations; but it retains sufficient autonomy and adequate sources of information to act on its own behalf when necessary.

The principal associations through which GLCA acts are the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) and its companion organization, National Institute of Independent Colleges and Universities (NIICU); the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE), The American

Council on Education (ACE), the Ad Hoc Committee on Tax Reform, and the Association of American Colleges (AAC).

The formation of NAICU was a direct result of actions by GLCA and likeminded colleagues from the independent sector. Their protests over what they took to be AAC's neglect of their policy positions led in 1975 to the setting up, under Edgar Carlson, of the National Representation Project alluded to above, which investigated the pros and cons of forming a national organization to represent the interests of private higher education. The results of the study were unequivocal: 60% of those responding believed their most critical need was for "a national voice for independent higher education." As a result, the Carlson group recommended that a separate national organization, "shaped and structured to fit the requirements of the representational function," be established to speak for the independent colleges and universities. GLCA Board members were among those who worked from within AAC to shape the new organization. The National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities split off from AAC in 1976.

Today, NAICU includes 850 institutions of higher education and 70 associations of such institutions. All GLCA colleges but Antioch belong to NAICU, and GLCA itself is represented by its president, who is a member of NAICU's secretariat. Two members of GLCA's Board of Directors have served as national officers of NAICU—George Rainsford as its chairman, Tom Wenzlau as its vice chairman. In addition, Richard Rosser (DePauw) and Philip Jordan (Kenyon) have taken on committee assignments, and both Wenzlau and Franklin Wallin (Earlham) are members of NAICU's board of directors for their respective geographic regions.

NAICU is a lobbying body that takes responsibility for public policy formulation and government relations activities on behalf of independent colleges and universities. Its purposes are to initiate and influence policies that form the context for independent higher education; to promote programs and policies that will assure students the widest possible choice of institutions to attend; to minimize governmental intrusion into higher education; to support fiscal and tax policies that encourage charitable giving to the independents; to analyze issues of concern to the independent sector; and to gather and disseminate data which support these purposes.

As the need for a reliable data base grew, the National Institute of Colleges and Universities (NIICU) was formed to provide research and related services on public policy and legal issues. With the help of various philanthropic foundations, it has developed a formidable data analysis capability. Its membership, officers, board of directors, and by-laws are identical with those of NAICU, but its organization, staffing, programs, activities and financing are all distinct.

The GLCA colleges joined NAICU as a bloc, and continue to operate as such under Fuller's direction. Their numbers, fortified by Ida Wallace's staff work and the coherence brought to public policy thinking by Fuller, enable GLCA to influence the positions adopted. NAICU in turn has become GLCA's primary means of bringing influence to bear on government policy.

Time was to show that NAICU's organizers had planned well: a 1980 survey of college presidents found that, of those who responded, and who were members of NAICU, 91% regarded that organization as either their primary or their secondary presidential association. NAICU had been needed.

AAC, much truncated by the loss of its representation functions, continues to support liberal learning nationwide. Lewis Salter, President of Wabash, serves on its board, and Jon Fuller on its advisory committee for the Project on the Status and Education of Women. Although AAC is no longer the primary vehicle for GLCA's public policy concerns, its interests often intersect with GLCA's, especially in the areas of international education, women's studies, and support for the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The American Association for Higher Education, a non-profit association of individuals with a common interest in teaching, provides a forum for many disparate interests. To receive its publications and to gain admittance to its annual national meeting, both energizers and sources of new ideas, GLCA encourages its officers to belong. There is an astonishing degree of cooperation between these two associations, even in situations where they might be thought competitive—for example, in seeking funding for similar projects. Fuller and Russell Edgerton, president of AAHE, were colleagues at HEW; Roger Baldwin, of AAHE's staff, wrote his dissertation on GLCA faculties. Relations among staff members are cordial and mutually supportive, their activities complementary: GLCA is more effective among its own members, but AAHE gives nationwide visibility and legitimacy to issues.

The American Council on Education, founded in 1918, comprises both institutions of higher education and national and regional associations. As the nation's major coordinating body for postsecondary education, ACE is the United States government's chief non-governmental contact on this subject. All the GLCA colleges but Wooster belong to ACE; Philip Jordan, President of Kenyon, is on ACE's Commission on Government Relations, while both Rainsford and Wallin have served on its board. Fuller serves on the advisory commission for ACE's Office of Women in Higher Education. The broad range of policy interests covered by ACE's large staff are almost all of interest to GLCA colleges, but GLCA focuses primarily on government relations, which are under the direction of vice president Charles Saunders, who has an understanding of the concerns and priorities of GLCA colleges. Although GLCA does not utilize ACE as its chief public policy representative because of the perception that the needs of smaller members may not be assigned a high priority within a complex organization, the two men are able to work together to keep their organizations within a range of mutually acceptable positions.

The Ad Hoc Committee on Tax Reform is an informal alliance of educational institutions which seek to influence tax law as it relates to charitable giving. The presidents of GLCA and ACM meet with this committee, which is mostly comprised of representatives of the large independent universities, together with a few public ones that likewise receive large private gifts, such as the

GRANTS RECEIVED BY GLCA
1963-81

Year	Source	Use of Grant Funds	Amount
1963	Johnson Foundation	Visiting Scholars Program	$ 3,000
1964-66	Ford Foundation	Non-Western Program	500,000
1964-67	U.S Office of Education	Programed Instruction Project	270,753
1965	Johnson Foundation	Yugoslav Program	5,000
1965-67	Kettering Foundation	Teaching Internship Program	330,000
1965	NSF	Teaching Internships in Physical & Social Sciences	212,000
1966	U.S. Dept. of State	Africa Summer Institute	1,500
1966	U.S. Dept. of State	Yugoslav Program	5,000
1967	Asia Foundation	Support for Visiting Japanese Scholars	6,500
1967	U.S. Dept. of State	Yugoslav Program	8,261
1967-69	Carnegie Foundation	Arts and Humanities Program	180,000
1967-71	National Endowment for the Humanities	Teaching Associates Program	160,440
1968	National Endowment for the Arts	Film Program	5,550
1968	U.S. Dept. of State	Yugoslav Seminar	5,261
1968	U.S. Dept. of Labor	White Freedom School	5,363
1969	Ford Foundation	Task Force on the Underprivileged	5,000
1969	U.S. Dept. of State	Yugoslav Seminar	2,500
1969	Arthur Vining Davis Fdn.	Science Program	8,500
1970	I. B. M.	Intensive Seminar in Mathematics	10,500
1970	Palisades Foundation	Unrestricted	6,000
1970	U.S. Dept. of State	Yugoslav Seminar	28,907
1971	Union Carbide Corp.	Oak Ridge Science Semester	5,826
1971	The Ford Foundation	Student Loan & Aid Study (with ACM)	30,000
1972	The Commonwealth Fund	Medical Education Study	32,180
1972	Union Carbide Corp.	Oak Ridge Science Semester	6,694
1973	Union Carbide Corp.	Oak Ridge Science Semester	8,594
1973	Jesse Phillips Foundation	Higher Education Admissions Center	6,000
1973-76	Lilly Endowment	East Asian Studies Program	380,000
1973-77	Lilly Endowment	Wilderness Education	50,000
1974-77	Reader's Digest Foundation	Wilderness Education	50,000

GRANTS (continued)

1974	Ford Foundation	Conference on Japanese Studies	3,000
1974	Lilly Endowment	Conference on Japanese Studies	4,725
1974	Council on Intercultural Studies and Programs	Conference on Japanese Studies	2,500
1974	Johnson Foundation	Conference on Japanese Studies	100
1974	U.S. Information Agency	Exhibit of Student Prints	4,545
1974	Union Carbide Corp.	Oak Ridge Science Semester	8,594
1974	Johnson Foundation	GLCA Conference on International Education	1,000
1974	U.S. Office of Education	Poland Seminar	29,875
1974	Waseda University	Japan Study Tuition Grants	10,085
1975	Lilly Endowment	Summer Conference on East Asian Studies	25,000
1975-77	National Endowment for the Humanities	Summer Conference on East Asian Studies	60,795
1975	Union Carbide Corp.	Oak Ridge Semester	8,559
1975-78	Lilly Endowment	Faculty Development Program	404,000
1975	Herbert & Grace Dow Foundation	Fresh Water Research Conference	4,000
1975-76	George Gund Foundation	Public Relations Audit	25,000
1976	Johnson Foundation	Conference on International Education	1,000
1976	Union Carbide	Oak Ridge Science Semester	9,000
1976	Waseda University	Japan Study Tuition Grants	12,150
1977-78	George Gund Foundation	Presidents' Book on the Liberal Arts	17,190
1977	Union Carbide	Oak Ridge Science Semester	17,842
1978	Union Carbide	Oak Ridge Science Semester	15,538
1978-79	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education	Women's Studies Program	122,300
1979	Union Carbide	Oak Ridge Science Semester	41,332
1979	National Endowment for the Humanities	Japan Study Challenge Grant	125,000
1979	Detroit Bank and Trust	New Writers Awards	350
1979	Chuseibukai	Japan Study Endowment	54,000
1979	Miles Laboratories	Japan Study Endowment	1,000
1979	Borg-Warner	Japan Study Endowment	1,000
1979	Ford Foundation	National Study of Women's Studies in Small Colleges	53,950
1980	Lilly Endowment	Planning Grant for a Faculty Career Renewal Program	31,125

GRANTS (continued)

1980	Japan Foundation	Japan Study Endowment	500,000
1980	Lilly Endowment	Planning Women's Studies Institute	5,000
1980	Lilly Endowment	Women's Studies Institute	175,000
1980	Union Carbide	Oak Ridge Program	54,024
1980	Witter-Bynner Foundation	New Writer's Award (poetry)	3,600
1980	Borg-Warner Foundation	NEH Japan Challenge Grant	1,200
1981	Union Carbide	Oak Ridge Program	24,470
Total			$4,220,264

JE
7/21/82

Universities of Michigan, California, and Texas. Already in existence when NAICU hived off from AAC, the Ad Hoc group maintains a low profile and a high-powered staff supported by some of its more affluent members, notably Harvard. It is a primary source of information and contacts for the GLCA president.

The Fruits of Grantsmanship

Throughout its lifetime, GLCA's policy has been to seek outside funding for projects its authorizes. Seldom is the members' assessment raised for any purpose other than matching the rising cost of office administration. Projects are kept going only as long as they are deemed educationally valid and can be funded by a combination of grants and student fees; programs that lose needed outside support are allowed to lapse. This policy requires the GLCA president (with the active assistance of Ida Wallace and interested faculty members) to spend a considerable portion of their time seeking grants and cultivating the legislative and regulatory environment that sustains grantsmanship. The fruits of their labor may be seen in the accompanying chart. Of the $4,220,264 in grants received by GLCA since its founding, approximately $1,000,000 was awarded by the federal government, $3,000,000 by philanthropic foundations, and less than $200,000 by corporations.[4]

Since 1974, federal grants to GLCA have diminished, although two substantial amounts were awarded in support of women's studies and the Japan program. (The colleges have continued to be funded individually, particularly for science education.) Increasingly, the consortium turns to the charitable foundations, particularly Lilly and Ford, as well as the semi-governmental Japan Foundation. Taken together, these funds enable the consortium to develop new projects and prevent the consortial administration from becoming a financial drain on its members. The continued generation of grant monies has resulted in an aura of success that suffuses the consortium, for it demonstrates that its ideas receive the approbation and support of a national contituency.

Summary and Conclusions

The decisions made during the pivotal year 1973-74 altered the nature of the consortium irrevocably. Impelled by the widening gap between tuition costs at private and at public institutions, GLCA began taking an active part in public policy formulation, attempting to influence the legislative climate for the benefit of the independent colleges and the retention of choice on the part of the student. Presidential budgets, congressional appropriations, administrative regulations, and the climate of opinion within which these all operated were now perceived as primary to the ability of the independent colleges to sustain—let alone raise—existing levels of service.

---

[4] Many corporations have a long established tradition of contributing to particular colleges; GLCA exercises restraint about entering this sector. The grants from the Union Carbide Corporation which appear on the chart actually emanate from the federal government, which contracts with that firm to run the Oak Ridge Science Laboratory.

Financial aid to students, support of undergraduate science education and of foreign language study, are essential to the high quality education that GLCA colleges deliver. Thus, tax law and the priorities of the great philanthropic foundations have become important determinants of their ability to maintain traditionally high standards and to sustain the forces of change. It is no longer possible to ignore the political dimensions of these problems, since the colleges must live with their solutions.

Because the Board has by now developed a set of general policies, Fuller is free to make specific tactical decisions within known parameters. This represents evolution since the days of Acres' presidency, when the attention of the Board was not consistently focused on public policy issues and each GLCA action was decided ad hoc. The result was that Acres had to consult at each step of the way, while Fuller does not. The constraints on presidential authority may be the same, but Fuller has better advance information and more scope to exert his own influence.

Concommitantly, the GLCA Board has been activated politically. Its members are heard from, collectively and individually, in NAICU, in the pages of respected journals of higher education, and before committees of Congress. The formulation of public policy positions within GLCA, and the effort to render them persuasive to other associations and to agencies of the federal government, gives Board members a far greater stake in the consortium than they ever had when the primary function of GLCA was to route students to off-campus programs or to improve faculty members' teaching, as important as these functions are. With the survival of their institutions at stake, the presidents became more willing to pool their collective influence for the attainment of mutually agreed-upon goals, and some have been propelled to positions of national prominence in the educational community.

In the politics of higher education, GLCA's struggle to find a voice for the independents led to a realignment of established associations and improved articulation of the independent position. GLCA has won for itself a respected place in the councils of the higher education establishment.

CHAPTER VI

GOVERNANCE

How is GLCA governed? The bylaws assign responsibilities to a Board of Directors and an association President, but this is not the complete story. The present system of governance emerged from evolution in these offices, organic growth in other sectors of the consortium, and the development of an unwritten system of interlocking obligations and courtesies.

Governance actually takes place at several different levels, some of them fixed at the center and others located at the periphery. It will be useful to look at each in turn: the Board, Faculty or Academic Council, Dean's Council, and the Ann Arbor office operating at the center, with the original International Education Committee and the Agent Colleges acting on the periphery.

Board of Directors

GLCA is formally a non-profit corporation belonging to its member colleges and operated by its Board of Directors. The Board approves all programs and projects undertaken by GLCA, sets the annual budget, and employs and evaluates the GLCA president.

At the start, the voting members of the Board included only the president of each member college, with the GLCA President sitting ex officio. Like the Covenant of the League of Nations, the GLCA bylaws enshrined the principle of the sovereign equality of all members. Meetings of the Board tended to be formal affairs, each member remaining supremely conscious that he spoke for his own "sovereign" institution and wary that cooperation might lead to some inadvertant damage to its interests. Eldon Johnson, while serving as GLCA president, wrote: "The commonly used United Nations analogy is false. The pattern is pre-UN—or to put it differently, summit conferences of presidents with perhaps an interim secretary."[1] Johnson found himself in agreement with the dictum that a federation is something that is designed to keep too much from happening.

From the historic autonomy of the colleges, there issued naturally a certain aloofness. In the abstract, cooperation seemed a good thing; its benefits, however, had to be proven. Each president had arrived at his position as the result of a distinguished individual career, usually in education or the ministry; secure in his own beliefs, he was under no psychological pressure to compromise. Further, each was responsible to his own Board of Trustees. There were probably instances—Washington representation, for example—when positions adopted by the various Boards of Trustees rendered the presidents unable to reach agreement when they sat as the GLCA Board.

---

[1] Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 37 No. 1 (January 1966):4

This situation altered over the years, partly as a result of a changing of the guard. The consortium was steadily opening up options the colleges would not otherwise have had, offering real incentives to cooperation. Loss of independence no longer appeared a realistic threat when it became apparent that the consortium, by increasing the alternative courses of action, actually enlarged the colleges' autonomy. As more programs came into existence, as the presidents gained confidence in one another and in the staff, and as the environment in which the colleges needed to function grew more challenging, the habit of cooperation flourished.

In 1971, the bylaws were amended to provide representation for faculty and one chief academic officer. The presence of faculty representatives allows for the expression of faculty opinion at the Board level but does not impinge on the "sovereignty" principle since, on important issues, a rule of one-college, one-vote is adopted.

Another reform made possible by the relaxation of presidential reserve was the devolution of responsibility to other sectors of the consortium. In the early years, the Board acted on hundreds of administrative details; for example, the presidents personally examined the budgets of all the off-campus programs. That responsibility has now been handed to a budget review committee, which examines and passes on each off-campus program budget before it ever reaches the Board. The budget for the consortium as a whole is now prepared by the GLCA president in consultation with a finance committee. The deans evaluate and oversee off-campus programs; office staff, in conjunction with advisory committees, handle administrative matters. In general, those functions that could be dealt with routinely were spun off, with the Board retaining its prerogative of making the final decision.

President Fuller channels most matters first to the Deans' Council, which meets a month before the Board, so that issues come before the Board with a recommendation for suitable action. A detailed agenda, with supporting documentation, accompanies the announcements of each Board meeting, so that Board members know in advance what decisions they will be called upon to make, and have time to discuss these with one another and with Fuller before the Board convenes. Although meetings are tightly organized, Board members remain free to bring up unscheduled topics as they occur. In this setting, a great deal of business can be transacted in a short time.

The Board meets twice yearly, once in the Midwest and once in Washington, D.C. During the capital session Board members consult with GLCA's own Washington staff and personnel from allied organizations such as NAICU and ACE. In addition to conducting regular business, Board members meet with government officials and congressional representatives to express and promote the interests of liberal arts institutions.

Freed of administrative detail, the Board now concentrates on policy issues, such as the initiation of new programs or the phasing out of those that are no longer viable; or the identification of legislative issues and agreement on an appropriate response. Decisions are reached through discussion and development of a consensus. Although dissenters are bound by majority decision, they can, in practice, opt out of participation; some of the colleges, for example, do not send students to all the off-campus programs. When objections cut to the core of what the consortium is about, a decision tends to be postponed until differences can be negotiated out. In these situations, the diplomatic skills of the GLCA president are tested, since he is in the best position to clarify, mediate, and broker disagreements.

Faculty Governance

In 1965, as they considered the future of the consortium in the light of four years' experience, the Board recognized that there ought to be a way to ensure that new ideas got heard and that workable ones got put into play. Since faculty were the matrix for new ideas, it seemed right to involve them in the governing process. The Board therefore voted unanimously to establish a faculty council of three members from each college (one of whom was to be the academic dean) to participate in overall policy-making. The deans were asked to work out implementing details, which they did with rather more caution than their presidents, recommending that the new Faculty Council be assigned an advisory role only.

The first meeting of Faculty Council (FC) convened at Wooster in May. Like the founding conference of GLCA itself, it was a heady assembly. President Eldon Johnson had commissioned the deans and active members of the consortial community to draft working papers, which became the basis for spirited debates. Conrad Hilberry reported on the Carnegie Program in the Humanities, Jack Bailey on the sharing of language resources, and Bob DeHaan on the Programed Instruction Project. The deans themselves presented substantial think pieces: Emerson Shuck (OWU) on GLCA's relations with graduate schools, Robert Farber (DePauw) on ways to utilize faculty mobility, Sherrill Cleland (Kalamazoo) on using Detroit public schools for teacher training, Calvin Vander Werf (Hope) on possible cooperative opportunities in science, and Morris Keeton (Antioch) on a model for optimum use of faculty resources.

Consideration of these issues alternated with efforts to define FC's own functions. These were identified as:

1. to make periodic review of the objectives and activities of the association
2. to examine problem areas and generate action through committees
3. to recommend projects to the Board
4. upon request of the Board, to give advice upon projects and policies
5. to adopt GLCA policy statements as recommended guidelines to the member colleges.

Despite the active mode of points 1 and 2, points 3 and 4 make clear that the faculty members gathered at Wooster regarded themselves as advisors to the Board, not as a legislative body. Point 5, by its uncharacteristically muddled syntax, betrays uncertainty over the way in which FC was to mediate between GLCA and member colleges.

FC did provide the forum which the Board wanted. Meeting twice yearly, it took up a wide range of issues by calling for reports from the relevant committees. It was FC that established the Task Force on International Education, reviewed early proposals for an arts center in New York, and encouraged formation of a film cooperative. In the fifteen months between Johnson's departure and Acres' appointment, FC partially bridged the gap by overseeing the off-campus programs and by its engagement with the major committees, such as International Education. Without its mediation, the consortium might have lapsed at this time. Nevertheless, FC's constitutional role continued to be only vaguely defined.

FC had no way of binding either the Board or the colleges to its decisions, and the fate of its recommendations was totally unclear. Certainly, the Board felt free to accept or ignore these. For example, when Johnson announced his impending departure from the GLCA presidency, Council recommended that the Board provide his successor with an assistant. James Dixon, President of Antioch and that year's Chairman of the Board, responded that FC's purpose was to "liberate faculty ideas, develop and promote them," but any increased staffing needs that arose as a result were not to be met by increasing the size of headquarters staff. This had been a consistent Board position from the start. When Board and Council positions differed, it was the Board that carried the day.

As the years passed, FC continued to have difficulty defining its mission. From the individual's point of view, service on it could be rewarding. Representatives could help plan new projects or participate in evaluating ongoing ones. Travel and engagement in a professional network were intellectually stimulating and expanded one's teaching arsenal. As a group, however, they were never able to settle into a coherent working body. Members were scattered over twelve campuses, met once or twice a year, and were chosen in disparate ways. They represented many disciplines and came from campuses with different forms of governance. They may or may not have been familiar with the programs they were being asked to oversee. Even when the Council reached agreement, no one knew just what had been accomplished since each representative disposed of only informal authority on his or her own campus, and the Council as a whole lacked authority to implement decisions. Loosely articulated, and geared to the free interplay of ideas, FC tended to waffle on decisions. From time to time, a resolution was tabled at its meetings calling for its dissolution.

Meanwhile, Acres was coming to rely more and more on the deans for support and advice. Although he thought FC a useful means to develop, clarify and articulate GLCA policies and activities, he was not always able to provide the logistical support it needed to keep current. As his attention focused on day-to-day decision-making, FC must often have seemed peripheral to his concerns.

Chief academic officers, on the other hand, were involved daily with problem-solving on their own campuses, a skill they transferred easily to the consortium. They had the authority to commit their colleges to GLCA positions, or they knew how to get it. Acres, working alone or with a series of young assistants, turned to them with increasing frequency, and many issues were disposed of long before FC convened.

A passionate debate was unloosed at the April 1969 FC meeting when Kenyon Dean Bruce Haywood introduced a motion to reassign functions, with a Deans' Council assuming most of what Faculty Council had been attempting. Those who believed that FC was needed as a brake on decanal authority voted the resolution down. To resolve the impasse, a joint meeting of the executive committees of FC and the Board was held. Its major recommendation was that officers of FC be seated as voting members of the Board.

As the Board reviewed the situation, its position hardened. Board Chairman Joel Smith, writing to Walter Fertig (Wabash), chair of FC's executive committee, opposed bringing faculty into the governing process. Smith believed that colleges were being damaged at that date by their incapacity to act, and that making FC a part of goverance would make matters worse. "I intend to resist complicating the procedures by which decisions are made within GLCA."

Amid speculation that FC would simply be killed off, the joint committee brought its recommendations to the Board in January 1971, which approved all the points agreed on, including a change of name to Academic Council (AC). Drushal of Wooster gained acceptance of a caveat that confirmed the determination of the presidents to keep authority in their own hands.

> Since the Academic Council is not a parliamentary body and since the Academic Council has voting representation on the Board, the Council's assignment to invite, generate, and refine educational ideas in no way precludes the Board's continuing power to develop and implement ideas.

At the same time, the Board authorized formation of a deans' "group" which was to meet "from time to time" to consider ongoing GLCA programs and standing committees. The deans were also given responsibility for evaluating programs and recommending Board action on them. Sitting as members of the Academic Council, they were to take responsibility for setting priorities in the development of new programs.

The reform of 1971 launched the Deans' Council, which has since become a major force in consortial governance. It did not resolve the problem of Academic Council, which continued to languish. Larry Barrett, who believed that faculty involvement was the key to keeping the consortium alive, attempted to use AC as a parliamentary body, scheduling it to meet together with the deans and with the professional activities committee. After hearing reports and deliberating on them, AC voted proposals up or down. But as before, there remained the problem of where a decision went after the delegates returned home. There was no mechanism for translating decisions into action.

AC's legitimacy and authority still were not established when Jon Fuller assumed the presidency, and for two academic years it did not even meet. Consulting with its executive committee in April 1976, Fuller invited suggestions on ways in which faculty members should be involved in the GLCA structure of governance. After considerable consultation, the election of faculty representatives to the Board was taken out of the Council and placed in the hands of the full faculties at each of the colleges; a system of rotation was set up to make certain that all the colleges would be represented in turn. AC's role was defined as providing counsel to the three elected faculty representatives, and in order to facilitate this, the annual meeting was set for Fall, just prior to the meeting of the Board. Since the first meeting of the reorganized AC in November 1976, the deans have not met together with it.

AC is now used principally as a means of sampling representative faculty opinion. Its agenda consists of reports by GLCA staff on projects contemplated, in progress, or completed; seldom do ideas for new projects emerge here. Consortial communication has improved, but the most meaningful messages proceed from the top down rather than from the grass roots up. As long as the system remains receptive to their ideas, there appears little likelihood of a demand by faculty for a more active role in governance.

Deans' Council

The chief academic officers had been meeting informally and irregularly from the start, often on the occasion of some national convention such as that of the AAC. Henry Acres began to coordinate their gatherings and to draw up agendas for them, but no official recognition was given to this group and it was not regarded as part of GLCA's governing structure.

The governance reform of 1971 was prelude to the deans' assuming a firmer grasp on the consortial helm. Once they had been officially recognized by the Board, their first action was to request, and get, a seat on that Board. They then moved to reduce all 12-member advisory committees (except International Education) to five, and to suggest that these meet less often, obtaining their costs from program budget rather than from the central office. Deans also instituted a system of evaluating off-campus programs under their supervision.

Separating from Academic Council in 1976, the Deans' Council took over many functions which AC had not been able to get a handle on. Several of the deans were actively engaged in administering agencies for off-campus programs, so oversight became more effective. All the deans familiarized themselves with the off-campus programs by meeting occasionally at their sites. These visits, planned in detail by the GLCA vice president, integrated the off-campus programs firmly into the consortium.

Deans, of course, have a comprehensive view of their own campuses: their politics, relations between faculty and administration, the personal idiosyncracies of their presidents. In the privileged setting of the deans' meetings, all this information flows freely, turning the Council into a support group as important for deans as the Board is for presidents--and rather more relaxed. Despite inevitable turnover, the Deans' Council developed an ongoing identity, stabilized by the long-term presence of such men as Joe Elmore of

Earlham, Bruce Haywood of Kenyon, and Lou Brakeman of Denison. Their good fellowship was even strong enough to sustain the appearance on the Council of the first female dean, Antioch's Hannah Goldberg.

Warren Board (Provost, Kalamazoo), Jon Fuller (President, GLCA), and David Marker (Provost, Hope), attending the Deans' Council meeting at Oberlin in April, 1982.

Jon Fuller, who at first envisaged his job as GLCA president as that of traffic cop, making certain that everyone with an interest in a subject was heard and that all options were aired, began the practice of channeling all issues of teaching and learning first to the Deans' Council for discussion; a month later, they are laid before the Board together with the Deans' recommendation. On occasion, if a matter already before the Board seems to require further investigation, the Board will send it to the Deans' Council before deciding on it.

Since GLCA is, at its heart, an academic consortium, and deans are the chief academic officers of their campuses, the Deans' Council has become increasingly important in the running of the consortium. It has proved invaluable to the consortial president as a source for consultation, and to the deans themselves as a network for formal and informal exchange of information. So much have they come to rely on one another's friendship and judgment, that in addition to the two regularly scheduled annual meetings, they now hold a third, informal one during the summer. Their working relationship with one another and with the GLCA president has become a primary force in binding the consortium together and enhancing its working effectiveness.

International Education Committee

The IEC, consisting of one representative from each college, was formed by the Board in May of 1962, making it the oldest of GLCA committees and for long the most central to its operation. The committee's influence stemmed from three conditions: it was involved in activities that were at that time the main focus of the association; its members included some of the most talented and dynamic faculty members of the twelve colleges; and they invested a great deal of themselves in the program. There was also a matter of timing. The Board gave the initiative in international programming to the IEC, and appointed Irwin Abrams as its Coordinator, in December 1966, when there was no Association president. The immediate motivation was the need to put together a proposal for funding under Public Law 89-698 (commonly called the International Education Act). In the event, that Act was never funded, but Abrams and his colleagues were able to charge the teaching environment at GLCA colleges with a dynamic concern for international education, as well as to design and launch a variety of programs for which Abrams provided, in numerous published writings, a solid conceptual base.

For each overseas program, the IEC set up an advisory committee comprising faculty members with a teaching or research interest in the area. These committees advised the agent colleges on how to carry out their mandate, and reported back to IEC on how that task was performed. Committee members arrived by a variety of routes: some were appointed by committee chairs, while some chairs were chosen by their committees. Some members and chairs were appointed by the International Education coordinator. Minute-taking not being a highly-developed art, committees seem to have operated to a large extent on collective memory—a situation complicated by continuous turnover in membership.

Meeting from two to four times annually on a budget funded equally by the central office and the agent college, the advisory committees concerned themselves with every facet of overseas operations from student recruitment to employment of resident directors. They reported back to the IEC, with Abrams sitting in on all meetings ex officio. Thus came into being a tight network of faculty members involved with international programming and wielding far more influence than did the Faculty Council, which was chronically unable to define its functions and seemed always to be operating on the outskirts of the consortium.

Abrams was on the Antioch faculty and already had many international connections through his work for that institution. He had the backing of Antioch's innovating president, Jim Dixon, who was coincidentally also chairman of the GLCA Board of Directors from 1965 to 1967. During half of that time, there was no GLCA president and Eve Mouilso was running the central office. Added to these circumstances was Antioch's role at that date as home base for the coordinators of three consortium-wide initiatives in International Education, Humanities, and Science. The consortium was, in effect, being run from Yellow Springs, and GLCA took on the appearance of a consortium within an International Education Committee. This situation confronted Henry Acres when he assumed the presidency of GLCA in 1967. He spent the next several years restoring the balance.

By 1972, Acres was persuaded that a restructuring of responsibilities was timely. The overseas programs were well established and running routinely under supervision of their agent colleges; program directors had introduced a high level of professionalism into their operations and were consulting with one another regularly; a budget review committee was overseeing the entire budgetary process for international and domestic programs; and there was hope that the newly-restructured Academic Council could hold the center of the committee system. The GLCA office was being asked to run on a slim budget, and the heyday of overseas expansion had passed, yet $37,000 was still being budgeted annually to sustain committee meetings and half the coordinator's salary. Moreover, GLCA had shifted its attention to domestic programs, making it less and less reasonable to maintain IEC in its unique position. Convinced of the need to restore the center, Acres eliminated the IEC and the position of Coordinator. Years later, he recalled delivering the message personally to Abrams at Antioch as the toughest task of his presidency.

Needless to say, IEC fought back, taking its case to the Board. A peace-making resolution was passed in November 1972, retaining the substance of Acres' reform: the position of coordinator was abolished. IEC was left intact with a membership of twelve, and the central office instructed to provide it with necessary support services (which it continues to do). The Board itself, while promising to seek advice from the IEC when appropriate, refused to bind itself to accepting IEC representation on all issues of international education which might come before it.

Throughout the caretaker year of Larry Barrett, the internal structure of the association remained fluid. At all levels of governance, questions continued to be raised concerning the way in which fiscal and management responsibilities should be divided.

When Jon Fuller assumed the presidency, he analyzed the situation as a political scientist. Clearly, it was the agent colleges which had responsibility for overseas programs. Just as clearly, these colleges could be committed only by their presidents and deans. IEC was an anomaly, a sort of floating presence, issuing instructions to bodies not directly responsible to it, making decisions which it had no power to carry out. Fuller was eager to keep the loyalty of those who had served the consortium so well, but he also needed to untangle the lines of authority. He therefore recommended, and the Board approved, a plan by which the GLCA president appoints the members of the advisory committees on nomination by the agent colleges. Thus, the three components--the agent, its advisory committee, and the GLCA administrator—form one articulated unit of governance. The IEC remains as a twelve-member group (each of the colleges is represented), but it is advisory to GLCA as a whole, not to the agent colleges. Its members are appointed by chief academic officers and its meetings are presided over by the GLCA president.

The net effect of this reform was to rationalize control over the overseas programs. Attachment of IEC to the central office in an advisory capacity, rather than allowing it to operate as a semi-autonomous body, reduced friction with the agent colleges. It probably lessened somewhat the participation of faculty in directing the consortium, but it should be remembered that at all times the membership of IEC was a small fraction of the total faculty and that, moreover, over the years, it had become extremely possessive about "its" programs. As other programs were added to the GLCA agenda, gaining a wider perspective was important.

At present, the GLCA president convenes the IEC once annually to seek its advice on the initiation of new programs and to discuss overseas operations generally. Increasingly, its members are professionals in international education who have been employed by their institutions specifically as directors of off-campus programs.[2] The GLCA vice president attends meetings of the advisory committees, a function that dovetails with his responsibility for overseeing the budgets of off-campus programs. IEC continues to receive all the information it needs for the purpose of discussion, but at the bottom line stand the Budget Review Committee, the Dean's Council, and the Board.

The Agent College

The agent college model for management of off-campus programs developed out of the work of the 1969 Task Force on International Education. Like any serviceable mechanism, it has passed through many permutations deriving from time and circumstance. Its evolution has been in the direction of taming the initial chaos of some of the early programs. Aberdeen and Beirut provide examples.

In 1963, an Ohio Wesleyan faculty member traveling in Scotland arranged for the admission of students to the University of Aberdeen, indicating that any allocated places not utilized by Ohio Wesleyan would be offered to the other member colleges of GLCA. The entrepreneurial professor was unaware that Antioch already had a working relationship with Aberdeen; making the connection for GLCA inadvertently displaced Antioch students, who now lost their direct access to the university.

When the resultant flurry quieted down, leaving a GLCA program in place at Aberdeen, Fred Klein (Dean of Antioch International) offered to act as agent for the program. Eldon Johnson accepted, contingent on approval by the Board. The program functioned, but there is no record of the Board having approved Antioch's agency. Six years later, Henry Acres wrote Klein asking whether Aberdeen was a program of Antioch or GLCA.

---

[2] Each college employs a director of international education who assists students in finding placements in overseas programs—whether run by GLCA, the individual college, or any other educational body. As professionals in international education, they are not lobbyists for any particular area program. This gives their meetings an entirely different tone from that which prevailed earlier.

With hindsight, the problems are easy to identify: a faculty member acting without consultation, a central office lacking sufficient staff to follow through on commitments, absence of a budgetary and oversight procedure that would keep the consortium advised of the activity of its agents. Later, turmoil on the Antioch campus became a factor also.

When William Placher (an alumnus of the program who went on to teach philosophy and religion at Wabash) was asked in 1977 to chair the Scotland advisory committee, he raised serious questions concerning the viability of the program and the power of the advisory committee to do anything about it. Replying, Jon Fuller wrote:

> The committee is established to advise the responsible administrators at the agent college (Antioch) about any and all matters relevant to the operation of the program. In a legal sense, the responsibility for operation of the program has been delegated to Antioch by the GLCA Board. Antioch's only obligation to the Advisory Committee is to listen to their recommendations. However, because the Committee represents several of the other member colleges, and because its advice is given "publicly" (either Donn Neal or I will be present at any of your meetings), the administrators at Antioch are not free as a matter of politics simply to ignore advice from the Committee.
>
> If the Advisory Committee were to recommend that the program be abolished, or that a new agent college be appointed, I would certainly see that the GLCA Board became aware of those recommendations and the reasons behind them, along with any response which the responsible officials at Antioch might wish to make.

Ensuing discussion in the advisory committee concerning three elements—the level of services being offered students, the possibility of reducing administrative costs, and means of enriching the program—led Antioch to agree to transfer administration of the program to Wabash. Dean Powell authorized a formal bid for the program, which was approved by the Board effective July 1, 1979.

Begun by accident and having survived both benign neglect and severe criticism, the Aberdeen program functions today under well-constructed guidelines, despite unusually high increases in tuition imposed by the British government. It is a prime example of the advance of professionalism in administration of off-campus programs through an agent college.

As agent for Beirut, Kenyon was beset by other difficulties. This program grew out of an agreement between Eldon Johnson and the then President of the American University of Beirut, Norman Burns. After a year of being administered from the central office, the program was adopted by President F. Edward Lund on behalf of Kenyon, apparently without widespread faculty consultation. Lund's willingness to assume this responsibility may have been related to the expectation that federal funds, to become available under the International Education Act of 1966, would enable Kenyon to establish a major in Near Eastern studies. However, the Act was never funded and Kenyon received no such grant. In the course of years, no faculty consensus was reached as to the importance of Kenyon's Beirut agency or the necessity of adding substance to the Near East course offerings on campus. In this single example of an overseas program that did not grow out of faculty involvement, administration was assigned to a faculty member with no disciplinary training in Near Eastern studies.

The Beirut program was a success in its own terms, but on the Kenyon campus it led to no significant augmentation of the curriculum. The Task Force Report on International Studies brought home to Kenyon faculty the need to assess their responsibilities. The recommendation that agent colleges become more than administrators of their programs—that they become resource centers for the entire consortium, offering a range of services to faculty and students—generated considerable self-criticism, with faculty split on the basic questions. Some, agreeing with a majority of student returnees, found the program a valuable component of undergraduate education. Others found Beirut a digression from their concept of what properly constituted a liberal arts education. The prevailing view was that the Near East program offered a valuable educational experience, of particular advantage to those students and faculty having a special interest in that part of the world. The size of this group, however, was extremely small; the program was viable only because it was able to draw on the entire GLCA student population. Considering that Kenyon students interested in other overseas programs received reciprocal benefits, the faculty decided they were warranted in renewing the college's commitment to the Beirut agency.

In a conscientious report dated November 1, 1971, Edmund Hecht, the program administrator, acknowledged widespread disappointment over Kenyon's failure to develop a stronger on-campus program in Near Eastern studies, including instruction in Arabic. However, "there is considerable indifference and resistance among Kenyon faculty to such a program. An expanded commitment to Middle Eastern studies might be too limited in scope to realize a broad base of acceptance and support on the campus." In the light of these remarks, it seems that GLCA's practice of placing agencies in colleges where there are faculty members personally committed to the study of that geographic area—a practice which at first glance seems to yield idiosyncratic results—turns out to be the best way of sustaining vigorous programs.

Budgeting for the off-campus programs was for many years a sort of wildcat activity. With the administration of each program in the hands of a different agent, the wide variety of management and budgeting styles that grew up exhibited the idiosyncracies of their home institutions. To complicate matters further, the various ecosystems into which programs were placed called forth different administrative structures. CEUCA was a creation of GLCA, its existence made necessary by the political configuration in Bogota. It had to operate quite differently from the GLCA program in Hong Kong, whose administration was perforce placed in the hands of others. For years, no single person in the consortium was in a position to grasp the financial condition of all the programs. It was Joe Rogers' achievement to bring order into the budgeting process during his term as vice president. Following further refinement by Donn Neal, budgets are now drawn up by the program directors and the agent colleges for submission to the GLCA vice president, who reviews them and makes suggestions where necessary before submitting them to the Budget Review Committee (BRC).

The BRC consists of the college president who is current GLCA secretary-treasurer, 2 college deans, 1 chief fiscal officer, 1 off-campus program director, the GLCA president and vice president. Scrutinizing all program budgets annually, BRC must give its recommendation before the budget goes to the Board for action.

Following extensive negotiation with the agents, Donn Neal delineated the present contours of the agent college in December 1978. Specifically, the agent college employs and evaluates the program director; collects, disburses and accounts for program funds; determines the program's format and calendar; and takes responsibility for its academic integrity. The agent receives an overhead payment of 3½% of all program expenditures, and may charge up to 5% of expenditures to defray specific expenses incurred by the college on behalf of the program.

Since it is acting on behalf of the other members of the Association, the agent college must seek advice and approval from a whole range of consortial bodies. Each program has an advisory committee made up of from 5 to 7 faculty members appointed by the GLCA president in consultation with the deans. The committee advises on curriculum, budget, selection of students, and general conduct of the program. Whatever the legalities of its responsibilities—and these have shifted over the years—its advice is seldom rebuffed. Differences tend to get negotiated out in committee, where all concerned faculty have input and none are closed out of the decision-making process. Campus representatives for each program, nominated by program directors and named by their deans, are responsible for publicizing particular programs on campus and advising students about participating in them. Each campus also has a director of international education, who is an administrator with overall responsibility in this area.

The Deans' Council has the special responsibility of evaluating off-campus programs. Usually, one program per year is examined in situ by a committee of 3 or 4, including 1 dean, 1 or 2 faculty members with an interest in the particular subject area, and 1 outside expert. The evaluation report is utilized by all those responsible for the running of the program to bring about improvements in it. The Board of Directors retains final responsibility for all GLCA programs, reviews and approves program budgets, receives reports of evaluations, and appoints the agent college.

Progress toward the ideal agent designed by the Task Force in 1969 has been circumscribed by the geographic distance separating the colleges from one another and from their programs, limited funds, and institutional rivalries. The fifty individually sponsored overseas programs (mostly in Europe) have not been coordinated and indeed are not in every case open to students from other colleges. It proved more practicable to start up entirely new programs for the consortium than to bring existing programs within a coherent plan. On the other hand, GLCA opens some of its own programs to non-GLCA students on a limited basis and in some years particular programs—notably, Bogota--would have had difficulty keeping going without these guests.

In none of the programs are there adequate provisions for science majors. As a result, these students have not benefited as much as humanities majors from the consortium's efforts to internationalize the curriculum. Another problem that has resisted solution is the need to integrate off-campus with on-campus experience. No one feels that this area has been dealt with adequately, yet continued focus on the problem has resulted in greater sophistication in addressing it.

The system of rotating resident directors at Waseda, Madurai, and Beirut opened up significant faculty development opportunities and also proved to be an important source of student recruitment. But problems arose with directors chosen for their teaching potential, not their knowledge of the local scene—a real disadvantage in troubled times. Also, the annual turnover of directors interrupts administrative connections and sometimes leaves the incoming director in the position of having to start over again. This problem can be alleviated (as at Zagreb) by employing a local faculty person as program associate, or (as in the case of European Urban Term) by employing a recent alumnus of the program to assist the director. Continuity is assured in the Bogota program, which has historically used resident Colombians as directors. This system, however, limits the opportunity for faculty development. There has never existed for Bogota the same coterie of dedicated faculty as that which developed around Beirut.

The agent colleges' capacity to provide a base for their programs is another variable. The most successful have been those that benefited from the enthusiasm, energy, and intelligence of specific faculty members for whom the program became a vocation rather than an administrative chore. Political factors in the external environment also need to be taken into account: successful programs collapsed when governmental policies changed. There is general agreement throughout the consortium that Earlham's has been the most successful agency—a success which like bread upon the waters has returned manifold blessings to the college in the form of grants and enhanced prestige.

The GLCA office, while it has oversight and supervisory roles on behalf of the consortium, does not actually run any program. It may recommend changes in program and create uniform policies where appropriate. In case of necessity, the president or vice president mediates among programs and among the various components of a program. In addition, GLCA staff make the connections necessary for maintaining the network of reciprocal obligations, and they coordinate the resulting meetings. Decentralization means that only the partial time of the GLCA vice president is required for oversight of all the programs. For performing the necessary staff work, GLCA charges 1% overhead. (Another 1% of program cost goes into a program contingency fund.)

This division of responsibility keeps most administrative matters at the campus level, where they are handled by college personnel (except in New York and Philadelphia, where the program directors have substantial autonomy). There are multiple access points for faculty who wish to get involved with an off-campus program. The decentralized style enables the consortium to operate with minimal staff; at the same time, because they link program components, staff remain aware of challenges and opportunities within the programs. Funding possibilities are brought to their attention by the Washington office. The model uses consortial ties to strengthen the joint effort, but leaves major initiative in the hands of the colleges and their faculties.

The Central Administration

The consortium originally established its headquarters at Detroit Metropolitan Airport, but high rents forced the office to move to Ann Arbor in March 1970, where it has remained ever since. No perceptible "tilt" has arisen within the consortium because of its geographic location, probably due to the decentralized nature of the administration.

The original decision of the Board to keep the staff small has been adhered to. President Acres reported in 1970 that the central office was staffed about as it had been eight years earlier; with a President, a full-time and a part-time secretary. During 1968-69, the Science Coordinator (Charles Glassick) was based in the central office and helped with general operations. During 1969-70, The University of Michigan assigned a graduate student (Paul Bradley) to GLCA. Considering the growth in size and scope of its activities, the office was seriously understaffed. Acres spent much of his time putting out fires, and the development of administrative routines was postponed. It may have been the guarded attitude of the Board toward committing funds to the administration of the consortium that prompted Acres to tell a conference of educators in 1981 that private institutions tend to regard interinstitutional cooperation as "committing an unnatural act in a public place." Acres continued, "The independent college may consider its institutional autonomy more precious than anything else, including teaching, scholarship, and public service."[3]

Gradually, as logic and external pressures led the colleges to take initiatives across the borders of campus sovereignty, the increased scope and complexity of the operation came to be recognized. Consequently, the Board has authorized the position of vice president continously since 1973. Joe E. Rogers (January 1973-June 1976) worked with Acres, Barrett, and Fuller; he was followed by Donn Neal (September 1976-August 1981) and Neil Wylie (September 1981-).

The vice president has two chief responsibilities: faculty development and oversight of the off-campus programs. In addition, he assists the president in a wide range of consortial functions, visiting the twelve campuses frequently, becoming widely acquainted with faculty, and tapping into their ideas for

---

3. As reported in Chronicle of Higher Education, 4/6/81.

consortial activities. Without the vice president, the consortium could operate only by curtailing activities.

Since 1977, there has been a Women's Studies Coordinator, housed in an annex to the central office. The position was maintained largely by outside funds until the 1981 decision to fund a half-time position internally for a trial period of two years. From January 1980 to June 1982, administrative support was supplied by Judith Elkin, who, as assistant to the president, directed the career renewal and change project, edited the Newsletter, and researched and wrote this history. Eve Mouilso continues as administrative officer, with the assistance of a computerized accounting service. One secretary, a Dictaphone word processor, and a Savin copier handle the correspondence. The staff operate under supervision of the president, who has principal responsibility for the sound management of business and corporate affairs.

With the assistance of a finance committee, the president prepares the budget and provides the Board with information about the budgetary implications of proposed projects.[4] Office operations are maintained by assessing the colleges (dues were $17,500 in 1981-82, rising to $20,000 in 1982-83 because of inflation and the decision to employ a WS Coordinator). The office also receives a 1% fee for administering off-campus programs and some overhead from projects funded by grants. Investing a small surplus each year has created a reserve fund which has operated in the black since 1970; should GLCA decide to dissolve, the consortium can give its employees one year's notice. Meanwhile, these reserve funds are available for starting up new programs which, once established, are expected to pay back the loan.

Somewhat less than half GLCA's income is expended on salaries; an amount equal to the assessed dues of each college goes toward operation of the Washington office. Governance—meetings of the Board of Directors, Deans, and Academic Council—costs from nine to ten thousand dollars annually.

It is the president's responsibility to see to it that meetings of the various levels of governance are arranged; either he or the vice president is customarily in attendance. In addition to the Board, deans, faculty, and program advisory committees already discussed, numerous professional groupings meet under the GLCA umbrella. Business officers, admissions directors, development officers, and student life officers all meet at least once a year. Channels for the exchange of information among them run quiet but deep. Originally, like the deans, they tended to gather at their respective national professional meetings. In recent years, there has been a tendency to formalize the GLCA groupings and to ask the office to arrange meetings. Although GLCA extends hospitality, these administrators and managers usually assume the initiative and much of the cost; in some cases, GLCA staff are simply invited to attend.

---

[4] The finance committee, consisting of the Secretary-Treasurer of the Association, the college president who most recently held that office, and one college business officer, was created by the Board during the 1970's, when GLCA was running an operating deficit. It has not met in recent years. Instead, Fuller circulates a proposed budget to its members and consults with them by telephone, submitting the agreed-upon figures to the Board for approval.

To college administrators, these meetings are increasingly important. The opportunity to share ideas, problems, and frustrations of their work reduces the sense of isolation that comes from being the only person on campus with a specific set of concerns. It is immensely helpful to share triumphs and frustrations with others who bear the same responsibilities. Collegiality helps check the erosion of energy and enthusiasm. More pragmatically, contact also leads to increased sharing of management data. Recent meetings of the business officers, for example, discussed changes in retirement law, computer systems at the colleges, IRS audits, energy conservation, food service management, administrative personnel compensation, and student financial aid. Most of these areas were surveyed by the central office and the results circulated among the colleges.

Exchange of managerial data is an activity that began slowly, due to the perception that each of the colleges is unique and that the exchange of data among them would not necessarily produce relevant results. Paradoxically, it was this perception of uniqueness that prompted the first survey. In these colleges, each of which regards itself as the best in its geographic region and thus not directly comparable to its neighbors, and whose faculties are not unionized, the setting of salary schedules was always problematic. A survey of faculty salaries conducted in the nascent GLCA in 1962, at the initiative of President Irwin Lubbers of Hope, became the starting point for a process of "leveling up" among the colleges. Circulated within the consortium, the survey became a model for an administrative salary survey that Eldon Johnson undertook the following year. Since the seventies, these surveys have been conducted jointly by GLCA and ACM, providing a pool of 24 or 25 colleges within which salaries for comparable positions can be assayed.

In May 1975, the Board asked President Fuller to establish a system for sharing additional management data. A working group comprising Linda Delene, Director of Institutional Research at Kalamazoo; Lawrence Elam, Controller of DePauw, and Keith Mathers, Controller of Ohio Wesleyan, identified data that were already being collected, selected out those which were useful to the consortium, and identified additional needed data. It was agreed to rely to the extent possible on data already being collected for other agencies, since in those cases the colleges need only send copies of their reports to the GLCA office.

The exchange now consists of three categories of data. The first includes information derived from the colleges which GLCA solicits, collates, codes for anonymity, and circulates regularly: faculty salary and fringe benefits, administrative salary and fringe benefits, admissions policies and budget, charges to students, monthly admissions data, financial aid policies for foreign students, and general financial statistics (from HEGIS). In addition, GLCA circulates a combined administrative directory, information on libraries (HEGIS) and a synoptic calendar showing the very diverse pattern of semesters among the twelve.

A second category comprises information which the GLCA office wants to communicate to member faculties and administrators. Most of this relates to the off-campus programs, including a directory of programs available, a list of advisory committees and campus representatives, fees and billing procedures, and a confidential evaluation of international programs other than those sponsored by GLCA.

On an ad hoc basis, the GLCA office also collects data as requested by one or an other of the colleges or by the Board. In the past, GLCA has surveyed minority enrollment, enrollment of male and female students by department, grading practices, liability insurance coverage for students, tuition benefits for faculty families, payment of moving expenses for new faculty, college organizational charts, policies regarding leaves for administrators, and personnel policies related to promotion, merit raises, and early retirement. Similar surveys conducted by college administrators, such as one on leave policies, are given currency throughout the consortium.

Although some Board members have suggested that the colleges move to increase the comparability of their data, creation of a consortial data base has not been undertaken systematically and is not universally viewed as a good thing. Several impediments exist, not least of which is each college's sense of self and consequent resistance to any move in the direction of standardization. Pragmatically, the development of standardized information is impeded by such factors as different academic calendars, different calculations of the faculty/student ratio, and even different concepts of what constitutes a college. Does the student/faculty ratio at Oberlin include music instruction in the Conservatory? Does an Antioch census include only the Yellow Springs campus, or the entire University network? Are only those students counted who are on campus, or should students away on off-campus programs be enumerated also? Obviously, different measurements may be used for different purposes. Comparability remains a tricky matter among these twelve highly individualistic institutions, and few of their administrators are attracted to the notion of accumulating data which might in turn generate pressure for conformity. Thus, although each college may have sophisticated means of measurement at its disposal, there has been no rush to compose a consortial data base.

The president is also responsible for maintaining a continuing review of all Association activities, proposing new ones, maintaining and improving those that work and proposing termination of activities that are no longer supportable. Fuller has succeeded in organizing at least one project that others had declared impossible: a faculty tuition remission exchange.

All the GLCA colleges offer faculty and staff children some form of tuition remission at their own institutions; some offer assistance in meeting tuition payments at other colleges as well. The idea of exchanging tuition privileges among GLCA colleges was mooted for years in the Faculty Council, and discussed in 1971 by both GLCA and ACM business officers. Their conclusion was that such a plan was impossible to work out.

By 1977, pressure had risen to review the matter again. With faculty salaries falling behind the general rate of inflation and the colleges not being in a position to increase cash benefits, some faculty were not able to afford to send their children to institutions of the quality they themselves had attended, or were presently teaching at.

At the direction of the Board, President Fuller worked out a scheme, which went into operation in academic year 1977-78, as a result of which some, but not all, GLCA faculty children are attending other GLCA colleges tuition-free. The accompanying chart shows the rather mixed result of the plan.

GLCA Tuition Remision Exchange

Academic Year	Applied	Placed
1977-78	13	11
1978-79	58	38
1979-80	59	31
1980-81	49	14
1981-82	45	23

The large number of unsuccessful applicants can be accounted for in terms of a "balance of trade." The rules of the game allow only two more students to participate in the exchange from a college than are matched by those entering that college under the exchange, and some colleges reached their export limit very quickly. At other colleges, demand for places exceeds supply, since for various reasons fewer faculty children attend other GLCA colleges, making it impossible for places to be offered to incoming students. (There are differences in the size of the eligible cohort from campus to campus and from year to year; and some colleges offer their faculties tuition remission at non-GLCA colleges.) Inability to find a match under the program does not, of course, prevent a student from attending the college of his choice; but then tuition must be paid, with or without assistance from the parent's home institution. During academic year 1981-82, 70 GLCA faculty offspring benefitted from the program.

Communications have always been a weak link in the consortium; a newsletter was not regularly published until 1978. But when GLCA considered the possibility of expanding its membership, the difficulty of consortium-wide communication became an issue.

Inquiries about joining GLCA had been received from other liberal arts colleges over the years, but as early as 1965 the Board, unable to anticipate the impact of expansion, had resolved against it. However, there were good colleges out there asking to get in. If the consortium worked well with twelve, might it work better with more members? What would be the impact on GLCA if a college dropped out? Just what was the optimum size, anyway?

In April 1976, long after the possibility of merger with ACM had been laid to rest, the Board appointed a committee consisting of Garber Drushal, (President of Wooster), Joe Elmore, (Dean of Earlham), Jack Padgett (Philosophy, Albion) and Sam Lord (Vice President for Finance, Kenyon) to examine the question. Their report showed benefits and disadvantages to expansion. Financially, approximately half of a new member's assessment would go toward servicing it; the rest could be applied to reducing the assessment of each college. Other anticipated benefits included expansion of the student pool which would help support off-campus programs. Expansion also seemed likely to enhance GLCA's impact on national policy, since it would be speaking for a larger group of constituents.

On the debit side, adding members would add to the complexity of the organization and make communication more difficult. And there was the tricky question of measuring the quality of an institution in order to ensure that the overall standing of the consortium was being maintained or even upgraded. Most important of all, there appeared to be no valid educational reason why the consortium should expand.

As the committee tried to develop criteria for admission, they became apprehensive about the changes that might result. Assuredly, a thirteenth member would not affect GLCA's nature substantially, but what of a fourteenth, a twentieth? Most of those questioned liked having a manageable number of people around the table. Expanding beyond that number—whatever it might be—could lead to problems in communication and the development of a bureaucracy. The problem was not finding suitable new members: it was how and where to draw the line so membership would not grow unduly. Thus defined, the issue came to be seen as developing criteria for rejection. This, the committee declined to do.

Seeing no clear educational gain to be made, the Board went on record as opposing expansion. To cover the contingency of a resignation, criteria were adopted for replacing a lost member. Any new member should be located in the same geographic area, be similar in size, and clearly comparable to GLCA institutions in academic quality. (A measure of changing attitudes is that, unlike the founding fathers sixteen years previously, the 1976 Board made no attempt to define the new member's relationship to church or religious teachings.)

To date, no member has withdrawn from the consortium, and no new member has been admitted. The Board has remained true to its decision not to expand.

Some Observations

Considering that in 1961 very few persons had experience in consortial governance, it is not surprising that the engine of cooperation ran rough for a few years. Several difficult situations—restructuring Faculty Council, rationalizing the position of the International Education Committee, adopting standard administrative methods for running the off-campus programs—had to be worked through before the consortium was fine-tuned. All these problems were resolved in favor of firmer control at the center and less autonomy at the periphery. This outcome was not due to any a priori decision; it sprang in each instance from the logic of the situation.

Through the exercise of tact, intelligence, and patience, the loyalty of the periphery was retained while authority was added to the center. Faculty concerned with specific decisions were continually consulted; deans, who began at the periphery of the consortium became a central element in its operation. The benefits of more orderly administration being undeniable, governance ceased to be an issue.

The decision to keep GLCA membership at twelve reflects satisfaction at the way the consortium is working. There is no sentiment that any particular problem could be better dealt with by either pulling out of the consortium or expanding its membership. Collegiality, the most prized outcome of association, accounts for both the decision not to expand and the relatively harmonious functioning of the various organs of governance.

In 1975, in a paper delivered before the American Political Science Association, Fuller likened GLCA to the United Nations, and its presidency to the UN Secretary-General. It had taken fourteen years to arrive at this level of integration.

CHAPTER VII

GLCA COMES OF AGE

"The common thread in all consortia is the joint venture among otherwise independent institutions in which members combine resources to maximize mutual gain and minimize individual risk. Unlike separate institutions, consortia exist in suspension among their constituents and are based entirely on serving members' needs."[1] GLCA's effectiveness cannot be measured in isolation, but only through its impact on its member colleges, their students, faculties, and administrations.

The consortium[2] came into being when Landrum Bolling and Jim Dixon realized that the openings they wished to create in international education would require more investment and more leverage than Earlham and Antioch could muster. Substantial early success in opening up new opportunities for foreign study gave purpose and direction to the consortium. Although international education is no longer GLCA's chief interest, those early gains have been retained and strengthened. Programs that could not survive political and financial vicissitudes have been replaced by others as opportunity presented. In the Fall of 1981, GLCA was sponsoring eight foreign study programs enrolling 104 GLCA and 79 non-GLCA students. It also had acquired access to Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the New York art world, the urban experience in Philadelphia, and the Newberry Library in Chicago; in Fall 1981, these enrolled 167 GLCA and 44 non-GLCA students.

Faculty development, which has contributed so much to keeping classrooms lively on GLCA campuses, owes major impetus to the consortium, which supplies an essential leaven that no single-campus program could. The weekend conferences, the workshop on course design, and a full schedule of women's studies activities keep up a fruitful cross-pollination among campuses. On several occasions, GLCA has entered the arena of social change: through the Philadelphia program, support for black studies, and, more powerfully, through sponsorship of women's studies.

Perhaps the project with the prospect for longest-lasting impact has been the Washington connection, including the evolution of the Independent Colleges Office and the founding of NAICU. Presidents of GLCA colleges have long been active in defense of the liberal arts, and their activities would have continued without GLCA support. But consolidated effort keeps them better informed, ties them into a national network, and amplifies their voices, ensuring that the views of the independent colleges will be heard during the framing of legislation that sets the context for their existence.

---

[1] Dan Martin (past president of ACM), "The Academic Consortium: Limitations and Possibilities," in Educational Record, Winter 1981: 36-39.

[2] The Council on Interinstitutional Leadership lists five criteria for this type of association. "Each consortium is a voluntary formal organization, has three or more member institutions, has multi-academic programs, is administered by at least one full-time professional, and has a required annual contribution." Consortium Directory, 1981:iii.

Not all efforts at collaboration succeeded. Some projects that seemed particularly amenable to cooperative efforts actually proved most resistant. Joint booking of lectures and concerts fell helpless before the realities of geography and the vagaries of academic calendars. Initiation of an athletic league was inhibited by pre-existing arrangements with other leagues and by the distances which teams would have had to travel in order to compete. Shared library resources were beyond anyone's capacity before widespread use of the computer; afterward, the need was filled by national networks. Inability to activate projects of this type, which seem almost mechanical in nature, results from the very real continuing differences among the colleges.

GLCA was not meant to be, and never became, a cost-saving or marketing device. The creativity generated by the coming together of faculty members and administrators from the twelve colleges vindicated the original motive, which was to support and improve liberal arts education. The most viable ideas led to the creation of programs, and programs cost money. The test question therefore is not, does GLCA cost the colleges money? but, does channeling money and effort through the consortium improve the education being delivered in greater measure than would channeling the same money and effort through a single college? To that second question, the answer is yes. The association has been a means of pooling resources to support new ventures; it is the expansion of potential that the colleges buy with their dues, which, amounting to approximately the salary of an assistant professor, seem a minimal investment for the return. Furthermore, the expansion of potential, once it became apparent, vanquished any residual fear on the part of the colleges that the consortium would diminish their autonomy. If autonomy means the capacity to make meaningful decisions, GLCA, by expanding the range of options, increased its members' autonomy.

To whom, then, does GLCA belong?

Like the elephant of the fable, the association exhibits different characteristics to different observers. Students, who are the primary beneficiaries, rarely come into direct contact with GLCA and may not even be aware of its existence. Partly because of rapidly changing student generations, they are not represented in consortial governance (save on one or two advisory committees). They have, however, been included in conferences on women and black students. Several early attempts by students to generate consortial activities (an annual volume of creative writing, an overseas air charter) were discouraged by the Board for lack of personnel to supervise them.

Faculty members have choices as to the degree of their involvement with GLCA. At one end of the spectrum is the innovator who generates a new initiative and sticks with it until the brainchild grows into a full-fledged program. Others enrich their professional lives by taking assignments as resident director at a program site, or by managing a program for an agent college. Service on the many advisory committees, providing a meaningful extension of professional interests, has turned these committees into effective instruments of governance. Reflecting the situation on most GLCA campuses, participation in formal governance of the consortium has been minimal. A decade of effort to give meaning and life to Faculty/Academic Council ended with that body becoming a reactive forum to staff initiatives. The three faculty members who sit on the Board can be construed as representative only in a philosophical, not a parliamentary sense, since nine colleges are at all times not directly represented. As GLCA became more and more a consumers' organization, representation became less of an issue. This situation is likely to continue, as long as the consortium remains open to suggestions from faculty as to the types of program they desire.

For most faculty members, the chief engagement with GLCA is through faculty development conferences. Individual faculty members may qualify for mini-grants derived from larger GLCA grants, such as that for Non-Western Studies, the Humanities, or Women's Studies. Some faculty members are also able to obtain tuition remission for their college-age children. By staying aware of developments in their professional fields and by following announcements in the GLCA Newsletter, faculty members are able to take advantage of a considerable range of opportunities, whether as entrepreneurs or as consumers of GLCA benefits.

Networking by business officers, admissions staff, development officers, and other administrators from the twelve colleges has fleshed out what was seen from the start as the mission of GLCA. The ideals of cooperation, free exchange of information, and mutual support were slow in being fulfilled, but the process has accelerated in the past few years in response to a series of financial challenges.

There can be no doubt that a flaw in the original design of GLCA was omission of a role for the deans. Operating as they do at the nexus of academic and administrative currents on their own campuses, chief academic officers are key figures in translating policy into action. Of all population segments within GLCA, they are now the most continually involved with the consortium. Half of them are actually overseeing GLCA off-campus programs, which makes them, in a sense, administrative officers of the consortium. The Deans' Council takes responsibility for shaping the alternatives that lead up to decision-making by the Board, supplementing and mediating the Board's authority, but in no sense displacing it. The GLCA president consults with deans individually and collectively far more than with any other segment of the consortial population. Without the mediation of the deans, the consortium would be far weaker and far less integrated with its member colleges.

At the top level, the consortium retains its original character as a Presidents' Club, in which membership is, however, more important now than it was twenty years ago. While they continue to exercise primary leadership for the consortium, the presidents cannot, in the light of their other obligations and no matter how highly they value GLCA, allow it to loom too large in their world. For this reason, they tend to lend the consortial president as much authority as he is willing to exercise. Meanwhile, the Board uses its reserve authority imaginatively, licensing an astonishing variety of initiatives. Receptivity to new ideas and flexibility in adapting to changing times have been essential to the forward movement of the consortium. These traits are particularly noticeable in the relationship with ACM; both consortia have felt free to act alone or in partnership, expanding or reducing their numbers as occasion warrants, but retaining at all times a continuous exchange of information between Chicago and Ann Arbor. This process was reinforced with the selection as GLCA vice president of Neil Wylie, who had been associate professor of psychology and assistant dean at Cornell College in Iowa, an ACM member institution.

Since the principle of sovereignty continues to hold for all important Board decisions, the only way to reach a decision is through consensus. What would happen in the event of an irreconcileable difference springing up among Board members on a matter vital to their interests is difficult to conjecture. Fifteen, even ten years ago, some colleges might have seceded, leading to dissolution of the consortium. Today, in addition to being a creature of its members, GLCA has developed its own reality, with an ongoing agenda, a working style, and a momentum of its own. The consortium which began as a proto-League of Nations and progressed by the early years of Fuller's tenure to the condition of a miniature United Nations, is now functioning in an integrated fashion more akin to that of the Universal Postal Union. Such organizations, though rooted in sovereignty, having developed a raison d'etre, are often able to continue their missions despite the defection of some of their original members--an event that at present seems unlikely to overtake GLCA.

Administrative decisions are routinely made by the GLCA staff, under the guidance of the president but with considerable autonomy of judgment. One curiosity is the functional split in the GLCA administration, with much of the president's attention directed to external activities and almost all of the vice-president's energies engaged internally. Concerned primarily with public policy formulation and the generation of outside funding, the president's chief GLCA contacts are the college presidents, deans, and other administrators. The vice president, on the other hand, is more involved with issues of teaching and learning, and thus has greater visibility among faculty. Since each operates with a great deal of autonomy, the consortium is actually running at two distinct levels, which come in contact only during office consultations or at Board meetings. The president is the only person with a comprehensive view of the entire range of GLCA activities.

Working decisions are made at all levels of the consortium, both at the center and at the periphery; the tide of events has run toward centralization, although, to a surprising degree, initiative remains with the people operating actual programs. At the outset, the unclear division of responsibility was capable of arousing considerable disagreement. The issue lay quiescent when a program ran well, but flared up in a crisis such as the release of a resident director, or the rejection of a student thought to be unsuitable, or differences over budget. The area of ambiguity was substantially reduced through adoption of some of the centralizing measures already mentioned, but not all the ambiguities attendant on decentralized administration will be resolved. Rather, GLCA tends to attract administrators who are comfortable with ambiguity and know how to utilize it to create optimal conditions for pursuing authorized courses. It is important for the consortial president and vice president to be able to provide leadership in ill-defined situations without resorting to hierarchical strategies that would not work. To a large extent, the history of GLCA is the resolution of ambiguity and development of "play" in its administration.

At its birth, GLCA harbored strong centrifugal forces deriving from the long histories of the colleges as autonomous institutions. With the colleges scattered over three states (many of them reachable only via two-lane country roads), geography exerted a divisive force. But the distance from one another was compensated by homogeneity. Shared values, as personified by presidents, deans, and faculty members, became the context within which ideas for consortial ventures emerged rather naturally, quickly finding outlet in surveys, consultations, and programs. Similarly, the emergence of Deans' Council counteracted the divisive forces of geography and autonomy, integrating the twelve colleges into a unit capable of concerted action.

The consortium's major organizational crisis, occurring toward the end of its first decade, did not originate, as might have been expected, in the model of the agent college. Rather, it was the emergence of exceptionally strong faculty leadership in international education at a time when the central office was understaffed that led to extreme decentralization and erosion of authority at the center, a trend that was reversed only in 1972. Nine years later, a similar crisis was nipped in the bud when the proposal that the Women's Studies Coordinator be made responsible to her own advisory committee was denied by the Board and the position made responsible to the GLCA president instead.

Centripetal forces at the beginning were few. The historic similarities among the twelve colleges, plus their shared system of values and similar ethnic origins, drew them into a relationship with one another but did not automatically engender allegiance to a central office. Partly because the colleges were not responding to any external threat, but were acting voluntarily in the hope of discovering future benefits, the office lacked a firm base in necessity at the start. It was only as a result of the efforts by successive GLCA presidents to discover what those benefits might be--"the mission of GLCA," as they put it—that the office gained legitimacy and acceptance by the Board.

The first step toward credentialing the office was the appointment of a highly esteemed individual, Eldon Johnson (himself a university president) as president of GLCA. The second was the award of the Ford grant in Non-Western studies, for it confirmed that the consortial office need not be a drain on the membership but could develop a fund-raising capacity of its own. With GLCA proposals continuing to attract significant outside support, this source of influence has not diminished.

Over time, as confidence in the idea of a central office increased, the importance of the responsibilities assigned to it increased likewise and centripetal tendencies were strengthened. The transfer of faculty development from its base at Ohio Wesleyan to the central office led to a real increment in influence, for this program is the principal means by which faculty are integrated into the consortium. Negotiation of a standardized budget procedure gave the central office a grip on the budgeting process for the first time in 1975, thereby enhancing its administrative credibility. The increase in programs requiring management contributed to the office's growth of influence; so did the increase in range and sophistication of the managerial data base. Management and investment of the reserve fund grew in importance as the size of the reserves grew. The Board has now acquiesced in the legitimacy of this growth by consenting to the continuous staffing of the central office by at least three, and occasionally four, administrators, plus the Women's Studies Coordinator.

The increased importance of legislative representation has enhanced both the role of GLCA in the national higher education community and that of the president within GLCA. The direction of policy planning lends itself especially to unified leadership. It is to the colleges' advantage to speak with a single voice. The increasing complexity of tax and financial aid issues makes specialization parsimonious. Fuller's skill in interpreting, coordinating, and advising in the legislative area has so inspired the confidence of the Board that the GLCA presidency has been vested with greater authority than ever before.

In working with Board members, deans, advisory committee members, and other key persons, this authority is expended judiciously to bring about a working consensus at all levels of the consortium. Like the presidents who preceded him, Fuller has resisted the temptation to establish a position independent of the members' will. The presidential approach has been that the well-being of the consortium depends on providing the leadership and services that members are willing to support, not on urging the Board to ever more heroic deeds. GLCA presidents have viewed their job as finding the shared ground, and then building on it the growing interests of the consortium. Self-restraint and an objective (rather than a partisan) approach to problem-solving have gone far toward winning acceptance of the president's leadership role from a group of highly individualistic college presidents.

It was noted at the beginning of this history that GLCA evolved during an expansive period for higher educaton. Founded in bouyant times when the colleges could afford luxuries, the consortium now faces a stressful period compounded of inflation, recession, declining student population, and diminished financial support by the federal government. How well will GLCA weather the storm?

As in measuring the cost/benefit ratio of the consortium, we must be certain we are measuring the right thing. Are the colleges better equipped to deal with these issues standing on their own, or are they strengthened by the mutual support they provide one another through GLCA? There can be only one answer to such a question. The record compiled thus far instills confidence that healthy and imaginative new beginnings will come from this consortium which has already contributed so much to its members and to the higher education community in general.

A NOTE ON SOURCES

The archives of the Great Lakes Colleges Association supplied documentary sources for the writing of this history. Interviews with some forty present and former faculty members and administrators at GLCA colleges, as well as with most of the persons who have been engaged over the years in administering the consortium, breathed life into the documentary record. All documents and tapes have now been deposited with the Michigan Historical Collections/Bentley Historical Library of The University of Michigan in Ann Arbor.

The author wishes to thank the many people who gave so generously of their time and assistance to this project, including those who read critically various sections of the manuscript. A special thanks to the staff of the GLCA office, without whose consistent support and readiness to answer questions, this history could not have been written.

JLE